

THE STANDARD

HENRY GEORGE, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

NO. 58-VOL. 1, NO. 6.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1888.

PRICE FIVE CENTS

VARIOUS MATTERS

The successful starting of the *Star*, with T. P. O'Connor in the editorial chair, is an event of much more than newspaper importance. The *Star*, the first half-penny morning journal in London, has at once leaped to a circulation of 140,000. Nor is this any wonder. The wonder is that such a paper has not been started before. The field has lain ready for it in the enormous working class population, who up to this time have had no more thought of buying a morning paper than of buying a half-crown magazine. One of the strangest things to an American who travels around London in the early morning has been to see trains, trams and 'busses crowded with people going to work and not a morning paper in a single hand. The stamp tax for a long time kept daily papers out of the reach of the working classes, and the penny journals, such as the *Telegraph* and *Standard*, which have come into such large circulations since the stamp tax was repealed, have been still too high for the great body of the working classes to get into the habit of buying them. They have been contented with an occasional sight of a daily paper at a public house, and with the purchase on Saturday night of one of the penny weeklies, which are made up of a rehash of the news of the week, and especially of the police court news. The *Echo* has already shown how successful a half-penny paper could be made in the evening field, and the sudden leap of the *Star* into a large circulation is doubtless the beginning of the formation of the morning newspaper habit among the London masses.

The most significant thing about the *Star*, however, is that it starts out on a more radical platform than any of the other London papers, and is edited by one of the best known of the Irish parliamentarians. Mr. T. P. O'Connor is well fitted for the task, for although his reputation has been gained in connection with the Irish movement, he has lived from an early age in London, where his newspaper education has acquired something of an American flavor, he having been a member of the New York *Herald's* London staff when that brilliant journalist, John Russell Young, was in charge of its London office. The starting of the *Star*, with Mr. O'Connor at its head, is an evidence of the tendency, which has been rapidly developing since Mr. Gladstone came out on the Irish side, to carry the Irish struggle into Great Britain and to make it part of the general democratic movement. This tendency the *Star*, with the enormous circulation which it bids fair soon to have, cannot fail to powerfully promote.

In his opening article Mr. O'Connor takes broad democratic ground. While vigorously presenting the Irish case, he declares that "Ireland wants home rule not much worse than the people of London," and that "no measure of radical reform for London can be complete which does not provide for the taxation of ground rents." He proclaims that it will be the mission of the *Star* "to divert the anger of the people from the visible tax collector to the invisible landlord that skulks and robs behind, and to bring home to the imaginations of the great fact that the specter of land monopoly does not stop short at the homes of the farmers or agricultural laborers, but penetrates to the inmost recesses of their own dingy streets and their own wretched attics."

"The elevation, the more constant employment, the better wages, the increase of food in the stomachs, dignity in the souls, joy, humanity, tenderness in the hearts of the people—these, and these things alone," he says, "represent to us progress, glory, national greatness." He proclaims war against every form of privilege, not only political but social, and declares that the first great step toward meeting "the terrible problem of hopeless poverty, unhealthy homes, and over-work or want of work among the masses of the people" is—

a vast and radical change in the land laws of the country. The spectacle at the same time, and sometimes even in the same country, on the one hand, of large tracts of land, returning to barrenness, and on the other of overcrowding in lane and alley and slum, is enough to make even the most reactionary Tory perceive that the land system has broken down.

As to the quick remedy of "protection," which is so vociferously upheld by some of the American supporters of the Irish movement, Mr. O'Connor, like Mr. Davitt, will have nothing to do with it. "Protection," he says, "is the remedy of the foolish or selfish, that must be vehemently and if needs be violently opposed;" while as for the preaching of emigration as a remedy for poverty, that is the elevation of blood-letting into a panacea.

The starting in London of a half-penny newspaper, edited by a prominent Irishman, and proclaiming such principles as these, is indeed a happy augury.

It is announced that Helen Taylor is coming to the United States and will be present at the Women's conference, which will meet at Washington in April. Among all the distinguished English men and women who have visited us there are

none more worthy of honor than Miss Taylor.

Ever since the death of her step-father, John Stuart Mill, whose inseparable companion she was, Miss Taylor has devoted fortune, time and talent to the work of social reform. She was the first woman to be elected to the London school board, where she has exerted great influence in improving education and fighting corruption, and has so endeared herself to the people of her district of Southwark that she has been elected again and again, despite the utmost efforts of the political rings and bosses that flourish in London as well as in New York, although not so much is heard of them. A thorough democrat in the highest sense of the word, every movement for the political and social emancipation of the masses has had Miss Taylor's hearty sympathy and active support, and for years, many of them of seeming hopelessness, she has been sowing good seed, not only in London but throughout the three kingdoms. Her devotion to the cause of Irish freedom has been especially marked and constant. When English liberals were vying with English Tories in upholding coercion, and with the exception of Joseph Cowen, hardly an Englishman of any prominence could be named who would venture to show the slightest sympathy with the land league, Miss Taylor went to Dublin to take the place of Anna Parnell should the government determine to arrest the Irish ladies who were carrying on the work while the men were in prison. And when the anti-Irish prejudice in England ran strongest, I have heard her asserting the rights of the Irish people to self-government and to the soil of Ireland, before English audiences who would have driven off the platform anyone but a woman so respected and talented as she. Miss Taylor is indeed a speaker of remarkable power, uniting to the highest womanly culture and grace a strong and trained intellect and a rare power of clear and concise expression. It is to be hoped that she will tarry long enough among us to make a number of speeches in various parts of the country, especially before the anti-poverty societies, with whose principles she is in hearty sympathy.

An interesting paper upon the credit system was read at the recent meeting of the national board of trade at Cincinnati by J. A. Price, president of the board of trade of Scranton, Pa. The ever increasing national debts of Europe he estimates at \$22,500,000,000, imposing upon its people an annual interest charge of some \$800,000,000, and in addition to this there are railway, municipal and commercial debts and mortgages to an amount that can hardly be estimated. Of the volume of indebtedness in this country he makes the following estimate:

Present national debt, Dec. 1, 1887.....	\$1,575,616,630
State.....	226,597,554
County and municipal.....	321,186,347
Railways.....	4,163,593,343
Banking.....	4,381,726,238
Private banking.....	1,500,000,000
Mercantile.....	2,840,000,000
Individual, otherwise than above.....	6,900,000,000
Aggregate.....	\$27,993,247,098

Estimating our population at 60,000,000, this would be some \$465 for every man, woman and child in the United States, or over \$2,000 for every head of a family. Some of the items in this estimate are of course mere guesses, and some of the debts included are of course offset and cancelled by others; but whatever deductions can on these accounts be made, the result is sufficiently startling. The civilized world—and our own country not last in the race—is rushing forward into a sea of indebtedness that must finally submerge in general bankruptcy and repudiation.

Colonel Price advocates the abolition of all laws for the collection of private debts, and in this he is unquestionably right. There is no more reason why the state should lend its machinery of constables, sheriffs and courts—still less as to a certain extent yet the case in New York, its prisons—to the collection of the debts of the individual, than that it should undertake to black his boots in the morning or tuck him into bed at night. The abolition of all laws for the collection of private debts would not only free our judicial machinery from a clogging mass of business which to a large degree prevents its performance of proper functions, but it would unquestionably lead to a far higher standard of personal and commercial morality, since character would then be the prime element in credit. If it lessened, as it undoubtedly would, the use of credit in commercial transactions, the result would be to put business upon a far more sound and stable foundation and to lessen the intensity of those commercial fluctuations in which periods of stagnation follow periods of speculation. The course of credit as a flux of exchanges is that it expands when there is a tendency to speculation, and sharply contracts just when most needed to assure confidence and prevent industrial waste.

The enormous figures that Colonel Price presents are also extremely suggestive in other ways. For instance, they are worthy the attention of those who believe in the belief that it is capital that oppresses labor, and that before labor can get its fair reward interest must in some way be abolished. The greater part of this vast volume of

indebtedness passes as capital, and on nearly all of it payments are regularly made. Yet the world-wide proclamation of a Jewish jubilee would at the blast of a trumpet sweep away this whole vast mass of indebtedness without the lessening by a single iota the wealth of the world. Nor, for the most part, does this volume of debt represent any ownership of real and existing capital. The mortgages, for instance, in greater part, do not represent capital loaned to the users of land, but mere rent charges—payments which the users of land have been compelled to agree to make to land owners as a condition of being permitted to use land. An eastern speculator or a foreign investor gets hold of a tract of western land, cuts it up into farms and sells it out to settlers on mortgage, or a tract of land near a city is cut up and sold in the same way. The seller gets obligations which are counted as capital and receives payments which are termed interest. But there has been in reality no production or transfer of capital, and the payments are in reality not interest for the use of capital, but blackmail for the use of land. So railway indebtedness really represents in large degree, not capital invested in making railways, but what is suggestively termed "water," and the interest they bear is not payment for the use of capital, but is a monopolistic blackmail upon the public.

As for the gigantic public debts, they represent capital only so far as there are public improvements to show for them. What they do, for the most part, as a matter of fact, represent, is either sheer public plunder, or capital and labor destroyed and wasted in war or preparations for war. Our own national debt, incurred during the war for the maintenance of the Union, is unquestionably the best and fairest of them all. But it does not represent, as is often assumed, wealth borrowed of foreign nations or of the future for the carrying on of the war. As a matter of fact we did not during the war increase our obligations to foreign nations much, if any, and it is as clearly a physical impossibility to borrow wealth from the future to carry on a war, as it is to get men still unborn to fight in it. The wealth that was used and destroyed in our civil war was that then and there existed. The carrying on of war by means of public debts, which is probably the most injurious and anti-civilizing of all injurious modern inventions, is not a device for spreading the cost of present expenditures over future time, but a device by which governments may obtain wealth from the classes who have wealth to spare, without exciting their opposition—since it gives them in return a mortgage upon the labor of the future. The United States might have come through the war without a penny of public debt if the government had taken wealth from its possessors as ruthlessly as it took men. Whether the wealthy classes would have submitted to this is quite another question.

But it is instructive at least to consider how different would have been the existing distribution of wealth if we had done so. And ever since the war our whole financial policy seems to have been steadily directed to making the taxation for the fulfillment of the obligations then given as onerous as possible. Where we borrowed forty, fifty and sixty cents, we have paid one hundred and twenty cents, with money wrung from the people by the most onerous systems of taxation—systems of taxation purposely devised to fatten monopoly and make the rich richer. We have paid off non-interest bearing debt in preference to interest bearing debt, and by means of the national banking system we have permitted the holders of a large part of the public debt to enjoy the principal while they draw the interest. By the national banking system the banker was allowed to draw from the government \$80,000 in money for every \$100,000 in bonds he deposited, and then to draw interest on the whole \$100,000. This proportion was subsequently increased to ninety per cent, and now a bill is pending in congress to allow the national banks a dollar in money for every dollar in bonds they deposit, while paying them full interest on the dollar. And not contented with this, and as though from the mere desire of paying as much interest as possible, and making the redemption of our public debt as slow as possible, we are actually buying up enormous amounts of silver, for which we have no more use than for so many tons of cobble stones, and storing it away in vaults. Secretary Fairchild sees the absurdity of coining silver thus to stow it away, and proposes instead that it shall be stowed away in bars. But why not leave the silver in the ore and the ore in the ground? That would be a far greater economy. As for the silver notes, that would be just as useful and just as readily taken if they promised to pay silver yet to be mined and refined, or if instead of promising to pay anything at all, they were simply made receivable for public dues.

But it is only when we come to think of the public debts of Europe that we realize the full importance of Thomas Jefferson's idea that no generation can have the right to bind a future generation, and that

every nineteenth year ought to be a year of jubilee, in which all public debts should be declared off. Were mankind agreed upon this, the enormous armaments of Europe would be impossible, and there is not a throne in Europe that would not crumble into dust. Colonel Price has opened a fruitful subject in calling the attention of the national board of trade to this matter of growing indebtedness.

General Master Workman Powderly, it is pleasant to learn, has now recovered from his illness, and it is to be presumed that he will soon resume in the *Journal of United Labor* his series of letters for the instruction of the 'order. One of the most interesting things he could do in this connection would be to point out for the benefit of the members of the order wherein lies the fallacy of the views on the land question which he promulgated in his official address in 1883. In that address Mr. Powderly said—the italics being his own:

In my opinion, the main, all-absorbing question of the hour is the land question. And did I allow this opportunity of expressing that opinion to the Knights of Labor of America to pass without taking advantage of it, I would prove myself false to my own convictions of right and justice. The eight-hour law, the prohibition of child labor, and the currency question, are all of weighty moment to the worker. But high up above them all stands the land question. Give me the land and you may frame as many eight-hour laws as you please. Yet I can baffle them all and render them null and void. Prohibit child labor if you will, but give me the land and your children will be my slaves. Make your currency of what material you choose, but if I own the land you cannot base your currency upon the wealth of the nation, for that wealth is the LAND. You may make the laws and own the currency, but give me the land and I will absorb your wealth and render your legislation null and void. Look over our western fields to-day and note the rapid strides with which monopoly is seizing upon the fairest acres of our country. The people of Ireland suffer from landlordism to-day; but a gleam of hope is ever before them, for if the worst comes they can go to America. Let the robbery of the people's heritage go on in the United States in the future as it has in the past and the hope of the immigrant will die out in his bosom, and soon a sentence to the mines of Siberia will be preferable to a residence in the land of his birth. The land is the heritage of God. He gave it to all His people. If He intended it for all His people, then no man or set of men has a right to monopolize it. We cannot say that the whole people who now inhabit the earth can claim the land. That would imply ownership, and if one man has no right to own the land, many men cannot own it. If all the people of the present day own the land we live on, what right will the millions yet unborn have to the earth to which their creator will one day bring them?

These are questions worth pondering over. There are men who fear the appearance of Banquo's ghost; but that ghost was an honest one, and no honest man had cause to fear it. So it is with the land question—no honest man need fear it. If I am told that our national legislature had a right to grant the land to corporations, I ask the question, From whom did they derive that right? The answer must be, *The people*. Yet I deny that right, for a people now living cannot give away what was ordained for the use of a people yet unborn. But granting that they had the right, then I charge, may I defy any man to produce a petition signed by a free people to congress, asking that body to give away land. If, then, that body had no right to give away the land, it should be compelled to restore it. It may be said that such a proceeding will unsettle society. Very well, then, let society for the time be unsettled, for it were better that a momentary disturbance take place now than a greater one later on, for with the rapid concentration of the land in the grasp of the few and the rapid increase in population, the time is not far distant when men will arise in the morning, and after knowing no law but that of the market, they will turn away from the table not knowing where the next one is to come from. When that hour comes the labor question will be harder of solution than it is at present. When that day comes it will take more than the sophistry now in use to convince these hungry men that one man has a right to own the land and all it contains while they, the children of the same Father, have nothing. When that day comes the logic of a hungry stomach will settle the question which wise heads are now endeavoring to solve, and knowing no law but that of the market, they will turn away from the table not knowing where the next one is to come from. When that hour comes the labor question will be harder of solution than it is at present. When that day comes it will take more than the sophistry now in use to convince these hungry men that one man has a right to own the land and all it contains while they, the children of the same Father, have nothing. When that day comes the logic of a hungry stomach will settle the question which wise heads are now endeavoring to solve, and knowing no law but that of the market, they will turn away from the table not knowing where the next one is to come from. When that hour comes the labor question will be harder of solution than it is at present. When that day comes it will take more than the sophistry now in use to convince these hungry men that one man has a right to own the land and all it contains while they, the children of the same Father, have nothing. When that day comes the logic of a hungry stomach will settle the question which wise heads are now endeavoring to solve, and knowing no law but that of the market, they will turn away from the table not knowing where the next one is to come from.

If I ever come to believe in individual ownership of land, I must, in order to be consistent, believe that the man who owns the land owns the people who live on it as well. If a man owns an island in the ocean, and he wishes to clear it of tenants, for the purpose of turning it into a grazing field, the man who admits that he has a right to own the land, must also admit that he has the right to order these people off its surface. If he orders them off there is no alternative but to obey. Suppose that through his unjust exactions of rent the tenant has had no opportunity of saving money enough to pay his passage to a foreign land? A very pertinent question to ask would be, Where will the tenant go? And the only answer the believer in the individual ownership of land can give will be, *Into the ocean*. Does any sane man believe that God ordained that any man should have such power? Such a doctrine is monstrous. It would do to say that such a case is only a supposition, and that no danger of its ever occurring exists. The question to consider is, would it be just or right for such a thing to take place? If not, then take steps to remove a system that would make such a thing possible. Give heed to this land question; be not afraid of the taunts or jeers of our enemies; do not quail at the name of communism if it is applied to you, for it were better to be called a communist than to be a party to the plundering of a people of the inheritance ordained for them by God.

The law condemns the man or woman who steals the goods from the common; But lets the greater felon loose Who steals the common from the people. God hasten the day when the "greater felon" will be brought to justice! And may

our organization be brave enough to shoulder its portion of the responsibility, and share in the glory of the achievement. If there exists such a thing on earth as a first title to the ownership of land, I have yet to learn of it; but in searching for it I found this in "Blackstone's Commentaries on the English Law": "Planned as they are with the possession (of land, we seem afraid to look back to the means by which it was acquired, as if fearful of some defect in our title. We think it enough that our title is derived by the grant of the former proprietor, by descent from our ancestors, or by some other means, and we do not care to inquire into the title of the original owner. Not caring to reflect that, accurately and strictly speaking, there is no foundation in nature, or in natural law, why a set of words upon parchment should convey the dominion of land; why the soil should have a right to exclude its fellow creatures from a determinate spot of the ground because his father had done so before him; or why the occupier of a particular field, when lying upon his death bed, and no longer able to maintain possession, should be entitled to tell the rest of the world which of them should enjoy it after him."

With so highly respectable and eminent an authority as Blackstone to quote from, we ought not to fear to open up this question; and if the few words I have uttered in passing will cause others to think, then the discussion to follow must lead to good results.

General Master Workman Powderly has for some time acted as though he had forgotten all this—as though he had become one of the "men who fear the land question." But the only attempt at explanation he has given is the following from the first of his articles in the *Journal of United Labor*:

Theories are advanced, which in themselves sound very nice as to the ownership of all land by the people in common. Before that object can be attained the people must learn to think "in common." It must first be demonstrated that the idea is practicable. I once believed that the people could own and till the soil in common. I did not believe that it was right for an individual to hold absolute ownership of the soil. To-day I know that an individual cannot hold absolute title to the soil if the interests of the people "in common" require that it should be otherwise. I no longer believe that the people "in common" can till the soil and own it in common. First, because they do not think "in common;" second, because the people are only people and not angels. In other words, the people are not good enough yet to discard the native selfishness which was born in them.

But this can hardly be considered satisfactory by the members of the order. In 1882 Mr. Powderly did not say one word about tilling the soil in common, and such an idea had evidently never entered his head. Whether he ever believed in tillage in common or has since ceased to believe in it, has nothing whatever to do with the plain principles of natural right that in 1882 he so clearly laid down. Nor yet is the fact which must in 1882 have been as evident to him as in 1888, that "the people are only people, and not angels," at all calculated to convince such men as the thousands of Pennsylvania miners now on strike "that one man has the right to own the land and all it contains, while they, the children of the same Father, have nothing."

Whether Mr. Powderly did or did not try to influence the pope, the propagandist, or Cardinal Gibbons, is a matter of small concern; but it would be a matter of great interest to know who or what has influenced the General Master Workman himself to ignore, and as far as he can do so, to repudiate, the brave and true words which he uttered in 1882.

We print this week a letter from Mr. John H. Keyser and an interview with him, which will afford much food for thought.

We also print some extracts, furnished by Mr. Herbert Slocum of Indian River, Michigan, from a circular issued by a firm of Mississippi land agents, which show in striking manner how in the south another form of slavery is taking the place of that form abolished at the cost of bloody war. This also contains much food for thought.

HENRY GEORGE.

The New Haven Land and Labor Club.
NEW HAVEN, Conn.—Will you please announce in THE STANDARD that the New Haven land and labor club has vacated Central labor hall and will hereafter meet every Friday evening in room 26, Boardman building, corner of State and Chapel streets. We propose to read and discuss a chapter of Henry George's works, or to discuss some timely topic at every meeting. We hope that every reader of THE STANDARD here will join our club and lend a helping hand in the work of education and agitation.
ALFRED SMITH, Sec.,
33 Whalley avenue.

The Harlem Anti-Poverty Society Holds Its First Public Meeting.

The Harlem branch of the New York anti-poverty society held a meeting at Temperance hall, 125th street and Lexington avenue, last Tuesday night, at which Dr. McGlynn discussed the aims and objects of the society. The hall was crowded, and the address was frequently interrupted with applause. Jerome O'Neill, the chairman of the branch, presided, and there were present most of the active workers in Harlem, and Miss Munier's Concordia chorus enlivened the proceedings with some of their songs.

Organizing in Larned, Kansas.

LARNED, Kansas.—Meetings of citizens of this town were held January 28 and February 3, at both of which I delivered addresses which were well received. After the close of the last address a united labor club of twenty-five members was organized, with myself as president, and prominent citizens as secretary and treasurer. A third meeting will be held on February 15.

W. M. GOODRICH.

The Cigar Tax.
The cigar makers of this city propose to hold a public meeting next week to protest against the internal revenue tax which the committee at Birmingham indorsed. The effect of the tax is to make it impossible for a workman to go into business for himself, and to concentrate the business in the hands of large employers.

THE FREE EATING ROOM CLOSED.

Mr. Keyser's Description of the Work Done at It and of Two Scenes on Washington Square on Last Saturday Evening.

On the first day of December last Mr. John H. Keyser opened a free eating room on Fourth street, a few doors west of Washington square. It required no advertisement to fill its tables from the start. It was run to its full capacity until Saturday, January 28, when Mr. Keyser was obliged to diminish the quantity of food given out daily, and in another week he was compelled to close it entirely.

On Monday a reporter of THE STANDARD saw Mr. Keyser, who is a stove and tinware merchant, at his place of business downtown. The hale old gentleman was seated at a desk, wearing an overcoat, in the lapel of which was a little bunch of white flowers, while a well fed gray cat had made herself comfortable on his knees. Mr. Keyser spoke in a strain of sadness of the closing of his eating room.

"Yes," he said, "I shut its doors for the last time on Saturday evening. I feel very sorry. I know that there are men, good men, going hungry to-day, and others are begging from door to door because they were not able to get a little something to eat at our room this morning. What many of them received there was a godsend. It kept away the pangs of hunger, and to obtain it they were not obliged to confess themselves paupers. More than three-fourths of all who came were first-class men, every bit as good as you or I. Some were men that I knew to be good citizens of my own neighborhood. Of course many, perhaps a third, were strangers in the city. On December 15, at the morning meal, I ascertained some facts about 344 of the men. Of that number 184 were men who had been working at trades and had lost their jobs through dull times; twelve were waiters, twenty-four 'longshoremen,' forty laborers, twenty-eight were of miscellaneous occupations, sixteen were semi-paupers and forty were what I would call full flowered paupers. There were four women that morning for breakfast.

"A good many of the men came to the room only under cover of darkness, either before dawn or after dusk, a fact which is very significant of the struggle they were undergoing between starvation and their feeling of self-respect. When some of them began coming they had overcoats, which, after awhile, were pawned. There was great suffering among them during the cold spell.

"Many of the men told me their stories. It was as a rule the one story that there was no work to be had. Business is demoralized, machinery is throwing many men out of work, the duties which were formerly to be looked for but once or twice a year and which lasted only a short time now come more frequently and last for months.

"It cost thirty dollars a day to run the free eating room. About 2,500 meals were furnished a day, 1,200 morning and evening. In the morning bread, butter and coffee were served; in the evening, soup and bread. An ample quantity was given to every man. At first the place was opened at 6 o'clock, but the line was afterward formed as early as half past 4, and as the laborers used to rush off to wherever there might be a chance to get a day's job, I opened at half past 5 for their accommodation.

"Yes, I stopped the work on Saturday evening. We couldn't feed those hungry men any longer. I was not encouraged, to say the least, by the charity organizations or the church. There is a church across the street from the eating room, but it never even offered the men a cup of cold water. One of the deacons did say that we were doing 'nice work,' and that if we would send the men over to the church they might be converted.

"It was such a sight as no man could ever forget—that line, sometimes a thousand men, waiting in the cold or the rain, for the room to be opened. On Saturday evening when we shut down there were squads of hungry, ill-clad men standing about on Washington square, and the chilly rain pouring down upon them. They had no place to sleep and nothing to eat.

"In fancy sketches, the conditions of the rich and the poor are sometimes contrasted. On Saturday evening the reality of the scene on Washington square surpassed anything that I have ever read in fiction. Within a hundred yards of our starved-out free eating room a reception was given in a palace that faces on Washington square—that fashionable center where people live whose wealth it is said aggregates \$75,000,000. In attendance at that reception were dukes, counts, lords and other foreigners of title, and the list of American names furnished to the Sunday papers indicates that it was a dress parade of the ultra-fashionable world—the very cream of the upper ten thousand. The hostess is described as wearing a diamond necklace worth a quarter of a million dollars. For weeks the fashion writers have been describing the brilliant scene within that palace, penning columns about the costumes of the ladies. They say the affair cost \$20,000. Lines of carriages were formed in all the streets near, liveried grooms were hurrying about on errands, and coachmen, well fed, and clad in white rubber coats, sat on the carriage boxes. Only to think of it, the cost of a single team and carriage would be more than the amount it took to run our little free eating room for a month. In the palace was warmth, music, wine, gold, diamonds, dazzling splendor. Standing outside in the rain, so close that the music reached their ears, and the brilliant flood of light pouring out of the windows shone upon them, were squads of hopeless, shivering, hungry men, disappointed of the poor boon of free bread and soup that had been cut off from them. Was there ever seen a more striking contrast between the luxury of the rich and the awful misery of the poor?"

The Twenty-first Ward Association of Brooklyn.

BROOKLYN, February 6.—The twenty-first ward association united labor party of Brooklyn held a very interesting meeting on February 2.

After the regular business had been disposed of the chairman made a few remarks, after which Mr. Pritchard read H. F. Ring's famous speech, "The Case Plainly Stated." The marked attention paid by all the members showed that they fully appreciated Mr. Ring's argument.

Mr. E. Sullivan Doubleday has volunteered his services for Thursday evening, Feb. 16, when he will read a chapter of "Progress and Poverty," and there will also be a grand musical programme by the association band. The association meets on the first and third Thursday evenings of each month corner Myrtle and Nostrand avenues.

JAS. B. CARROLL, secretary,
618 De Kalb avenue, Brooklyn.

QUERIES AND ANSWERS.

A LONG SESSION.
ST. LOUIS.—If I understand Mr. George's proposition it is this: Remove all taxes from whatever is the result of labor and tax the land to the full extent of its rental value.
Now, let us test the practical working of this scheme by a little of simple arithmetic.
(1) Smith owns three city lots valued at \$1,000 each. Upon two of the lots he has built houses costing \$4,000 each. One of these houses he occupies and has furnished at a cost of \$1,000. The other house he rents out at an annual rental of \$500, just ten per cent of the full value of the house and lot. The third lot is vacant. Smith owns also a lot in the suburbs, by city improvements, for which he paid \$100. He also owns a steamboat worth \$50,000. Smith's property, then, consists of the following: Three city lots at \$1,000, \$5,000; one suburban lot, \$100; two houses at \$4,000, \$8,000; furniture, \$1,000; steamboat, \$50,000. Total, \$62,100.
Upon this he pays taxes in 1888 just about one per cent of the full value, or \$621. In 1889 Mr. George's law goes into effect and Smith is taxed only the rental value of his land. This rental value was shown to be ten per cent of its full value, and its full value being \$6,100, Smith pays in 1889 a total tax of \$610, or \$11 less than in 1888. With the money so saved he buys three other suburban lots adjoining the one he already owns, paying for them \$100 each. The remaining \$11, with a little added, he uses to embellish his vacant city lot, which has alongside of it a house he occupies by planting trees and flowers in it. As his taxes are so much reduced he can well afford to retain that vacant lot for a domestic pleasure ground. But in 1890 the city begins to move out in the direction of Smith's suburban lots, and they go up in value \$25 each. The four are then worth \$500 and he pays on them \$50. In 1891 they become worth \$550 each, and he pays taxes on a valuation of \$550, or \$55. In 1892 the street is improved and the street railway extended beyond these lots; a boom takes place, and Smith sells his lots for \$500 each, or \$2,000 for the four. The lots cost him in the first place \$400; he has paid taxes yearly on them—\$10, \$50 and \$50—\$110, and special tax for street improvements, \$200; total, \$800. He sold them for \$2,000, and made a net profit of \$1,200. Not a bad result of land speculation under the operation of Mr. George's scheme.
It is evident that if the rental value of land be ten per cent of its full or selling value (and as regards city lots this is very near the mark), the increase from time to time in the rental value must equally be one-tenth of the increase in the full value, leaving the land speculator, under the George scheme, as his profit, whatever the increase in the full value of his land, and where real estate is booming, makes a very pretty profit, and is hardly calculated to altogether prevent speculation in land.
(2) Here is another case: Jones is the owner of ten city lots. They came to him by inheritance, but he is otherwise poor: he works for a salary, and has no money for building on his lots. He has placed them on the market for sale, and holds at \$1,000 each, with the expectation of a boom. The present selling value is \$600 each, and on this valuation he pays in 1888 a tax of one per cent, or \$60, on the ten lots. In 1889, under the George law, they are taxed \$600, their estimated rental value. Jones cannot raise this amount of money, and so his lots are put up at tax sale; but nobody will buy them, for the boom that Jones expected did not come; his lots have fallen in value, and are now considered of no desirable property. Nobody wants to build on them, and run the risk of having empty houses on his hands, and nobody wants to hold the lots unimproved and pay the heavy taxes on them. So year after year they lie idle, yielding the city no revenue (for the government cannot tax itself) until they are entirely forfeited to the city. So Jones has been robbed of his patrimony, by process of law; the city gets for its streets and out of its revenue and every city, it appears to me, will be afflicted with just such unproductive lots here and there, or vacant lots producing nothing but unpaid taxes.
(3) Take a third case: Brown owns a city lot worth \$10,000. Upon it he has erected a building for \$10,000. This building he rents to Robinson, a manufacturer, who occupies it with his machinery and stock, which are worth \$100,000. This piece of property then represents value as follows: Lot, \$10,000; building, \$10,000; manufacturer's plant, \$100,000—\$120,000; and in 1888 it pays tax of one per cent, or \$1,200. In 1889, under the George law, it pays only the rental value of the lot, or \$1,000. So the city loses \$200 in taxes, the capitalist landlord saves \$100 in taxes and the capitalist manufacturer pays no taxes at all, adding yearly \$1,000 to his capital.
(4) From a consideration of these three cases it is evident that the present revenue of the city is mainly derived from the tax on buildings and personal property, and that to remove this tax (however the tax may be raised to its full rental value) will be to greatly reduce the city's income. Of course the tax on the country outside of the city will have to be proportionately increased, but of levying a state tax in the city, as now, city taxes will have to be collected in the country. Without going into figures it is clearly evident that the full rental value of a farm must be greatly in excess of the amount now paid by the farmer in taxes as a small percentage on the valuation of his land, his house, his stock and other property. It is equally evident that to largely increase the farmer's taxes (as Mr. George's law must do) makes him pay to the state the full rental value of his land) will be to swallow up the now too meager profits of agriculture, to discourage farming, to sell his land, if he can, and invest his money in some city enterprise exempt from taxation, to drive the countryman into the city and deter the city man from going into the country; to increase capital on the one hand and poverty on the other.
It may be that I misunderstand Mr. George's theory. If so my premises are wrong and my argument falls to the ground. But if my premises are true my argument, it seems to me, must stand. If in either premises or argument I am wrong I desire nothing more earnestly than to be set right, for though I have read "Progress and Poverty" I have as yet been unable to find any one to answer my arguments satisfactorily either to myself or no.
(5) I desire to say a word on another subject. I assert that money is a convenience for hoarding and that it possesses this faculty, possessed by nothing else, that it will keep for generations and will grow by the mere keeping. To illustrate:
A man has \$10,000 in money and invests it in government four per cent bonds. These he locks up in the vault of a safe deposit company. In one year they have grown \$400. This amount he re-invests in bonds and locks them up with the others to grow. I shall be told that his \$10,000 did not begin to grow till he put them to use by lending them to the government to help carry on its functions. This is partially, but only partially, true. He lent his money to the government and the government put it to use, but he did not. He merely exchanged his non-growing money for another form of money that had in itself the germs of growth. When he made the ex-

change with the government there stood two parties each holding \$10,000 in money, for bonds are money quite as much as greenbacks. One party, the government, used its money; the other party, the man, locked his money up. He could have exchanged these bonds for goods to sell or in machinery to manufacture, or in building houses, so as to give employment to others while yielding profit to his owner. But he locked it up and it grew, doing nobody any good, not even benefiting himself, except in the name of having it. Again, I shall be told that land possesses the same faculty of growing in idleness, and that the man in question might have invested his \$10,000 in land with the same result as its investments in bonds. This again is partially and only partially true. Money, whether buried in the ground or locked up in a vault, is equally money withheld from circulation, from use, from benefiting society. But money locked up in a vault, if well secured and bearing interest, is sure to grow. Money buried in the ground may grow or not. I have known (so has everybody) repeated cases of men who bought land on speculation, held it and paid taxes on it for years, then sold it for less than it cost them. There is a risk in buying land, but none in locking up interest-bearing money. So I return to my first proposition, that money is the only thing that will surely grow while kept in idleness.
M. O. GILPIN.
(1) Here is a fair specimen of "statistical" reasoning. An isolated case is selected or imagined, a quantity of assorted statistics relative to it is gathered, "a little simple arithmetic" is applied, and although obvious facts, far more simple than the arithmetic, are wholly ignored, the result is pointed to as a demonstration. Mr. Gilpin has never read "Progress and Poverty"; he has never thoughtfully considered the influence of general economic principles upon production and exchange; he does not appreciate, if he knows, the effect upon land values of a land value tax, nor upon production of exemption from taxation; and yet, because in his example in "simple arithmetic" his Smith escapes a large item of taxes which most Smiths escape now, and speculates in land as some Smiths do now in greater degree, he imagines that the whole philosophy of the single tax is exploded.
Mr. Gilpin correctly states the single tax doctrine. It contemplates the removal of all taxes from products of labor and the taxation of land to the extent of its rental value. This would make it profitable to produce goods and unprofitable merely to buy land. Indeed, when the tax had reached its highest limit, there would be no real buying and selling of land, and long before that point was reached most land would have no selling value. Real estate would be bought and sold as now, even if the tax were imposed to the full extent, but prices would be governed by the value of improvements, and not at all by the value of the land. This effect, which is understood by every one who is familiar with the first principles of political economy, Mr. Gilpin wholly ignores, for he assumes that Smith may use his savings in taxes for the purchase of three suburban lots at as high a price when they are taxed ten per cent as they were held at when they were taxed but one per cent. Assuming, as Mr. Gilpin does, that ten per cent is the full annual value, no land would have a selling value. Selling value is only a capitalization of rental value, plus a speculative premium; if you tax away the whole rental value, there is nothing on which to capitalize; and if it is understood that the tax is to increase with increase of rental value, speculation is discouraged. No man will buy a thing from which he can never expect an income; and, though Smith might pay \$311 less in taxes in 1889 than in 1888, he would not invest that \$311 in the purchase of three suburban lots, the rental of which was, at most, but \$10 each, if the tax on each were also \$10.
But suppose that Mr. Smith were as simple as Mr. Gilpin's arithmetic, and did buy those lots, and suppose that in 1890 they rose in value \$35 each, so as to be worth \$125, or, to state it accurately, for they would have no selling value, suppose their annual rental value rose to \$12.50 each. The four lots would then be worth \$50 a year, and would, as Mr. Gilpin says, be taxed \$50 a year. In 1891 they would be worth \$20 each or \$80 in all, and the tax would be \$80; and in 1892, under the influence of the "boom," they would be worth annually \$50 each or \$200 in all, and the tax would be \$200. Now, conceding Smith's simplicity, where would he find any one else so simple as to pay him \$2,000 for those lots? Mr. Gilpin's sum in simple arithmetic needs radical revision.
As Mr. Gilpin makes no point of the reduction of Smith's taxes other than to suggest that the same may be used for land speculation, a suggestion which I think he will now concede is due to his error in supposing that land which is taxed up to its full rental value can have selling value, it may not be worth while to say much regarding the reduction in Smith's taxes. At any rate, I shall say no more than this: The tendency of taking taxes off of labor products will be to enable their owner to sell, rent or hire them for less than now with the same if not a greater profit, and therefore, using exact figures for the sake of illustration, to compel Smith to rent his extra house, worth \$1,000 and now taxed \$40, for \$400 instead of \$500, and to carry goods and passengers on his steamboat, worth \$50,000 and now taxed \$500, for \$500 a year less than he is forced to charge now. That is, the reduction of taxes on his furniture and the house he lives in will be the only reduction that Smith will save; the reduction on his other house and on his steamboat will be saved to his tenant in one case and to his customers in the other. Smith's benefit from these reductions will be due to increase of business. If a storekeeper makes one sale for sixteen and one-half cents of a cake of soap that has cost him ten cents and on which he has paid a five cent tax, his profit is one-half a cent less than if he makes two sales on which there is no tax. His benefit is in the increase of his business and the smaller capital required. Smith's benefit would be of the same kind.
But I am not quite through with Smith. He owns a vacant suburban lot worth \$10 a year on which he is paying a \$10 tax. Smith will not continue to do that. If he wants to use the lot he will use it and pay the tax; but, then, his demands upon trade will tend to make it more active, to im-

prove business and to raise wages. If he does not want to use it he will stop paying the tax, and the lot will forthwith become nobody's or anybody's lot, and will so remain until somebody goes upon it and improves it, which he will be at liberty to do on no worse condition than that, whether he uses it well or not, he shall pay its value once a year in taxes. Smith has also a city lot worth \$100 a year. Perhaps he will make a pleasure ground of this, as Mr. Gilpin supposes; but if he does, he will create a new demand for labor, which is precisely what we want him to do.
And now, Mr. Gilpin, seeing that Smith could not speculate in vacant lots because they would have no value; that he would have to use both of his vacant lots, or abandon them, because it would be unprofitable to hold them out of use; that the taxes remitted from his other property would be remitted to his customers rather than to him, and that all this would improve business and increase wages while securing to the public its own—the value of land—what objection have you to the single tax so far as it relates to the case of Smith?
(2) Jones's case is simpler than your arithmetic. If those lots are of right common property they are not Jones's patrimony at all, and he loses nothing when he loses them. He is at present depriving his fellow citizens of an unalienable right, the right to a place on the earth, by trying to make them pay to him \$1,000 for what is as much theirs as his. If, on the other hand, these lots are Jones's property, as his hat or his coat is, to interfere with him in exclusively controlling them is wrong. I do not propose to discuss this question, but refer you to book 7 of "Progress and Poverty."
There is, however, another than the moral question involved in this case. It is evident that the lots have no real value, for you say "nobody wants to build on them." Their only value is speculative, for Jones "holds at \$1,000 in expectation of a boom," though no one wants to use them. Yet, the expectation that a great many people will want to use them soon is so great that any speculator is willing to pay \$600 for the chance of levying a private tax on the users when they appear, and Jones is not disposed to sell the chance for less than \$1,000. But when the lots are forced on the market at tax sale, the "boom" not having arrived, "nobody wants to build on them," "nobody wants to hold them" and "nobody wants to use them," and they bring nothing. Jones therefore loses nothing but the chance of levying a private tax on the production of the future. That is a queer kind of "patrimony."
What would really happen would be this: In 1888 Jones has ten lots worth in the market \$6,000, but which he holds at \$10,000. In 1889 the single tax is imposed to the full limit, say ten per cent. Jones then has the alternative of paying \$600 or repudiating ownership of the lots. If he repudiates ownership he must pay the tax, but no one can compel him to own land that he does not want to own, and if he repudiates ownership the lots will be free to any one to occupy. Of course the market would be affected by such a condition. The value of land would fall, and a new equilibrium of values would soon be established. That might be at a point at which these lots would be worth nothing, in which case Jones or any one else could build upon them without paying any tax until values rose. But if the new adjustment fixed the value of the lots at \$10 each per annum, liability for that tax would be the only condition of taking possession.
So far as the loss to the city is concerned there is no cause for worry. The lots are unproductive now. If Jones pays a nominal tax to the city it is only for the purpose of being permitted to levy blackmail on citizens when they shall desire to make the lots productive. By making all vacant lots free or practically so the city will prosper in far higher degree than by selling privileges to some of its citizens to retard improvements. In 1888 any one who wanted to build on any of those lots would have to deplete his building fund by paying Jones \$1,000 for the privilege and would be taxed on every brick that was bought and every day's work that was done; but in 1889 whoever wanted to build would need only to go upon one of the lots, and no matter how much labor he employed or materials he bought would have no taxes to pay except to the extent of the annual value of the land he entered upon. Which of these two conditions would tend to make the city the more prosperous?
(3) The city would get \$1,100 less in taxes from Brown and Robinson than before; but using exact figures for illustration, as I did in Smith's case, Brown's building being untaxed, would rent for \$1,000 less, and as Robinson would save in taxes his machinery, he would save in taxes \$1,000, and in factory rent \$1,000 more, or a total of \$2,000, to say nothing of the saving of taxes on his products, the entire benefit of which would go, in the first instance, to his customers, and ultimately to the consumers of his goods.
(4) How Mr. Gilpin manages to infer from three hypothetical cases that the present revenue of the city is mainly derived from the tax on buildings and personal property is something of a mystery. It probably is a fact; but it is not a legitimate inference. And though it is a fact, what of it? It does not follow that less revenues would be derived from a high single tax than are now derived from low miscellaneous taxes. Nor, because the revenue falls off in the three cases Mr. Gilpin has evolved from his inner consciousness, is it to be inferred that it would fall off generally? A very careful estimate of land values in the city of New York below Forty-second street shows that the annual value of land there is fully three times the whole revenue of the city, and the same proportion, approximately, will hold good, no doubt, in all cities. But suppose city revenues fell off, that would not involve higher taxation in the country. If land is to be taxed to its full value, country land could not be taxed more than its value because city revenues diminished. If land values were insufficient for public expenses, public expenses would have to be reduced. Nor is it true that the full rental value of a farm

is in excess of the amount now paid by the farmer in taxes. Of the entire value of a farm, one-third is ample allowance for land value. Then in the case of a \$60,000 farm, the value of the bare land would be \$20,000, and at fifteen years' purchase, which is about the proper estimate in this country for agricultural lands, the rent or tax would be less than \$134. Now, what farmer owning a \$60,000 farm, does not pay, in direct and indirect taxes, more than \$124. This makes no allowance for the fall in land values that must accompany the imposition of the single tax in consequence of the death blow it will give to land speculation.
So far from swallowing up the meager profits of agriculture the single tax will lower the taxes of the farmer, expand his markets, make his trade more active and increase his wages. It will do the same for all workers and will bear down upon none but the Joneses, and upon them only in relation to what you call their "patrimony" and not at all in regard to their salaries if they work.
(5) Your proposition about money is just as unsound as your single arithmetic and evinces the same kind of half thought or confused thought that appears in your other questions. Money in idleness never grows. It is only as money is in use, representing real and active capital, that it may be said to grow. If you buy a flock of sheep with, say \$500, that money represents the sheep; and if in the course of time the wool and lambs increase so as to make your flock worth \$600 over and above the value of your labor, measured by what it would have justly earned you in, say digging ditches, your \$500 has grown to \$600. So if you buy the honest stock of an honestly conducted railroad company, for \$500 and receive an honestly earned dividend of \$100 your money has grown. The increase you receive in either case is not a tax upon any one—it is not forced from many one without an equivalent. But if you buy a government bond for \$500, you are doing precisely what you would be doing if you bought a piece of land as an investment—buying a power to tax other people for your benefit; and if you receive interest to the extent of \$100 in one case or rent in the other, your money has not grown, but you have added somebody else's money to yours. In the instance of the flock of sheep or of the railroad stock, you are getting an increase that your capital has added to the general stock of wealth, and nobody is the poorer; but in the instance of the government bond or of the land investment, you are getting what somebody else has added to the general stock of wealth, and somebody is poorer. Your money has been idle and it has not grown.
You are quite mistaken in supposing that you will be told that land possesses the faculty of growing in idleness. It does not grow at all. The demand for land grows and that enables those who own land that is wanted to levy private taxes on people who want it; and it makes no difference if some speculators do make a mistake in supposing that the land they buy will be in greater demand. If they lose by their speculation they are like "nigger" speculators before the war who bought black babies and supported them and paid taxes on them only to have the babies die on their hands. The risk in that kind of speculation could not justify chattel slavery nor can the risk in land speculation justify private land ownership.
A Farmer and a Mortgage Clerk.
DENTON, Mass.—If the single tax were adopted would this be the result?
A farmer holding fifty acres of fair agricultural land is taxed (irrespective of improvements) say fifty dollars each year, while a neighbor has built a ten roomed house and has a fair garden place, the whole occupying half an acre; his land, reckoning it at house lot price in that district, can only produce some three dollars tax. At the same time this neighbor is a rich man and derives a large annual income from his position as managing clerk in a western mortgage office. He goes every day to this city office some twenty miles away. The clerk produces no wealth, but draws largely from western workers. The farmer produces new wealth every year, and this by hard toil, care, thought and enterprise; again he employs labor. At present their taxes are about equal—which, to say the least, is anomalous, seeing the clerk has ten times the income of the farmer. Would it not produce a sense of injustice in all such cases under the reformed system? And are they not likely to occur by thousands upon thousands? Would not the burden of government expenses fall in these cases where there was the least ability to bear?
ONE WHO DESIRES TO SEE THE CAT.
The probability is that a farmer holding fifty acres of "fair" agricultural land would pay no taxes, for land would be so plentiful that "fair" agricultural land would have no market value. The reason that "fair" agricultural land has much or any value now is because nearly all land is monopolized. But the single tax on land values would make it so unprofitable to keep land out of use that the real estate market would be glutted with unused land.
But to take your illustration as you give it: The farmer would pay \$50 in taxes, while the clerk would pay \$3. At first blush, to one who has only thought of questions of taxation along beaten paths, this does seem unequal; but consider a moment. What does each man receive from the community in return for taxes? Since land is naturally common property, no individual having any better right to it than any other, whenever the community protects an individual in the exclusive use of particular land, it confers upon him a privilege which is greater or less according to the value of the land. Now, what is the value of the privilege which the community confers on the farmer in your illustration? Fifty dollars a year. And what is the value of the privilege which the community confers on the clerk? Three dollars a year. Thus so far as their respective relations to the land are concerned, these two men are taxed equally; he who gets a fifty dollar privilege pays fifty dollars, and he who gets a three dollar privilege pays three dollars.
This much you will no doubt concede, but you will argue that the clerk has a great deal of untaxed wealth while the farmer has comparatively little. Assuming that the clerk earns his greater wealth by superior industry or skill in production, or saves more by being less wasteful, what right has the farmer to complain? What

theory of morals can justify the farmer in demanding, or you in demanding for him, that the greater industry or more prudent habits of the clerk shall be punished by a tax? In a case of public necessity so great that the land values, which in justice belong to the whole community, are insufficient, a plea for the taxation of people according to their earnings might be entertained; but so long as public property is ample for public need it is moral larceny to take private property for public use.
What makes this seem an injustice to you is the fact that many, if not most, wealthy people do not earn their wealth. That your thought is influenced by this, appears in your supposition that the rich clerk is "managing clerk in a western mortgage office." I do not intend to say that such a clerk may not earn what he gets. If he does earn it you have no right to tax part of it away on any pretense of equalizing his income with that of a farmer who earns less. But, assuming that the clerk does not earn his income, how does he get it? Evidently through monopoly. And what kind of monopoly? Just as evidently the monopoly of land. There would be precious little business for western mortgage offices if every cent that every man earned was exempt from taxation, and land values were so taxed that all unused land was free. It is our system of taxation, which lays taxes on labor products at every turn of the wheel of industry and permits appropriators of God's earth to make the people pay them for using it, that makes the opportunity of the western mortgage office. Take taxes off of all labor products and collect all revenues from the value of land and your "managing clerk in a western mortgage office" will have to earn what he gets in a way that will add to the wealth of the community. When that happens we may know whether he really earns more than the farmer; and if in these circumstances he does earn more you will find it difficult to prove that he ought to pay any higher tax unless he appropriates more valuable land.
The truth is that most farmers' taxes would be less under the single tax than they are now, for the value of the farmer's bare land is a small proportion of his wealth. And since that tax would kill the mother of all monopolies, the private ownership of land, and make it easy to get rid of her brood, no one would be able to get wealth except as the farmer gets it, by producing new wealth every year.
If you want to "see the cat" do not rely upon answers to haphazard questions, but read "Progress and Poverty," in which "the cat" is so vividly pictured that a man of your evident intelligence cannot fail to see her.
Notes.
EDW. HIGGINS, Fall River, Mass.—Sometimes Mr. George does use wages in the quantitative sense; but regarding the division of wealth into rent, wages and interest and the tendency of rent to increase and wages to decrease, the term is used as one of proportion. If rent increases in less proportion than productive power, then, though wages as a proportion will fall, as a quantity they will not, but will rather rise. But if rent increases in greater proportion than productive power, wages will fall as a quantity. Now, private ownership of land generates speculation, and speculation abnormally lowers the margin of cultivation until it raises rent in a proportion almost if not quite as great as the increase of productive power, with a strong tendency to lower it still further. For a full explanation read chapters III and IV of book 4, "Progress and Poverty."—I do not think that a work on political economy calls for very serious consideration when its author is responsible for the notion that a house and lot bought for \$10,000 and which without being improved afterward sells for \$50,000 is a case illustrating the "unearned increment of a house." It would be like gravely reviewing the spelling book of an author who didn't know how to spell b-a-k-e-r.
LOUIS F. POST.
A Novel Suggestion.
The following unique suggestion for open bargains was written on January 1, but has hitherto been overlooked:
NEW YORK CITY.—I recognize the full force of the reasons adduced in favor of nominating a presidential candidate. I recognize also the fact that, taking the Union all over, the machines of both the democratic and republican parties are so hopelessly corrupt that neither party is entitled to the least respect or consideration from us, and enlightened citizens can but wonder that a people which has shown such amazing powers of organization as have the people of the United States should not long since have devised a means of escape from the rule of such parties, or have at least availed themselves by overwhelming millions of the opportunities our party has furnished them. Notwithstanding all these considerations, others of greater weight have determined me to cast my voice and vote against the making of such nomination.
The conversion of a majority of the people of this country to our view upon the cardinal principle of our party by any ordinary process of propaganda would be a slow and laborious work which few of the present members of our party would live to see achieved. In the mean time, much might be gained and extraordinary means of propaganda secured by adopting the course I am about to recommend, and that especially in presidential years, which ought to be regarded as a golden for the opportunities they will furnish us.
In nearly every state in the Union the party in power is the more corrupt party in that state. Wherever this is the case a bargain should be made with the party of the out— or with the less corrupt party, if by chance the less corrupt happens to be in power—that in exchange for their agreeing to endorse our candidates for congress and the state legislature we would place their presidential electors upon our tickets. As this would elect the republican electors in New York it would almost certainly elect a republican president, but it would as certainly give us a large number of absolute free traders in congress, and they, combined with the democrats, could force an advance in the direction of free trade, and prevent any increased robbery of the people for the benefit of the few under the guise of "protection."
Of course if the republicans should repeat their blunder of 1884 and nominate a candidate whose election would be an irreparable disgrace to the republic, I am not prepared to say that even in New York an alliance with that party would be desirable; but it is to be hoped that even their machine politicians have learned the lesson of their defeat in 1884, and will, at least, select a candidate of unblemished reputation to set against so doubtful an opponent as President Cleveland.
Of course if such a bargain be made we

shall meet with occasional disappointment, as many of the republican machine men will play false and sell out to the democrats. They did so in 1886 and in 1887 and will do so again in 1888.
Neither could we expect that all of the rank and file would accept the contract, as to which I propose that there should be no attempt made at concealment, but that the whole thing should be open and above board, and if then we are careful to nominate upright and capable men, who, being endorsed by the regular republican organizations, would be the only opponents to the democratic candidates, very few republicans would refuse their support to such a "plan of campaign."
So far as New York is concerned, it is only by such means that we can hope to efface the county democracy and Tammany hall as the regular democratic organizations; but by adopting this course the national democratic committee would come to see that an entire reorganization of New York by its state committee, and failing them, by the national committee (in which neither of those utterly corrupt bodies should be recognized at all), will be a *sine qua non* for recovering the state in presidential years.
In Pennsylvania, on the other hand, the alliance would, I suppose, have to be made with the democrats. In California, with the republicans, and so forth, the general principle to be observed being to ally ourselves with the less corrupt party in each state, and, other things equal, with that party which will concede us the largest number of members of congress and of the state legislature.
Convinced that this is the wisest course for us to pursue, I have paved the way by discussing it with influential members of the republican party both in this and other states, promising all discussions with the assumption that J. G. Blaine does not receive the republican nomination. The door is open.
I should not be surprised if a majority of your correspondents should favor the nomination of a presidential candidate; but if you will require that each correspondent should furnish you his age I am confident that the old men will be found on my side. "Old men for counsel, young men for war," is an old and wise maxim which has heretofore been too much disregarded in the councils of our party. To meet the case of your requiring your correspondents to state their ages to ensure the publication of their views on the question under discussion I inclose you a statement of that of Yours sincerely,
MONTAGUE R. LEVERSON,
Fifty-eight on March 2, 1888.
Henry George in Washington.
WASHINGTON, Feb. 5.—Henry George's lecture last night, under the auspices of the Howard university alumni association, on the subject of "Protection and the Labor Question," was a great success, and has much inspired the single tax men of Washington. "It was not a common crowd," says the Post of this morning, in premising its long report, "that greeted Henry George in Masonic temple last night. It was an intelligent and well-dressed crowd, which as quickly appreciated and applauded the involved statement of an economic principle as the eloquence of a well-read period. Not few congressmen and senators, too, were scattered through the audience."
A committee of the Howard alumni, including several clergymen, were seated on the platform, with a number of local advocates of the single tax principle. Mr. Jesse Lawson opened the meeting on behalf of the alumni association, and Paul Bowen, one of the most prominent and influential of our Knights of Labor, introduced the speaker.
Mr. George made a most effective address, holding his audience in rapt attention from beginning to end. He began by pointing out the relations of protection to the labor question, and congratulating his audience upon the promise of a national campaign in which, instead of personal character or dead issues, economic questions of the highest importance would be discussed. Of President Cleveland's message he expressed warm approbation, saying that although it did not go very far, it went far enough to clearly and unmistakably take ground against protection, and had already produced so much discussion that it was now too late for cowardly democratic politicians to prevent the tariff question from becoming the issue. He then went on in a lucid and vigorous manner to express the popular fallacies of protection, and to show that the cause of labor could hope nothing from protection, and that justice alone was competent to do away with the evils wrought by injustice. Tracing the cause of low wages and unemployed labor to the primary wrong of making natural elements the private property of individuals, Mr. George expounded the single tax doctrine in a way which produced a marked effect. His invitation to answer questions was promptly taken advantage of by the audience, and for nearly an hour after the lecture proper Mr. George met objections, and answered questions put to him in a manner which gave the greatest satisfaction.
At the conclusion of the meeting, but not until after the greater part of the audience had got out of the hall, it was proposed then and there to form an anti-poverty society, and the city of Washington. A preliminary organization was formed by the election of Paul Bowen as temporary chairman and Charles Frederic Adams as temporary secretary. Some forty names were given in and the society will hold its first meeting on the 22d of February, when it is expected that many others will join.
The Brooklyn Tax Reform Club.
The Young men's tax reform club of Brooklyn met on February 1, in Everett hall, Fulton street and Gallatin place. Though the attendance was but slender, it was evident that those present were thoroughly in earnest. Mr. A. L. Voorhees was elected chairman and Mr. Alcott secretary.
After the transaction of regular business Mr. George White addressed the meeting on the questions: "Why, with our vast resources and increasing powers of production, are two million men idle and millions more working for a bare living?" and "Is the single tax a remedy?" Mr. White's address was brief and modest, but evinced his knowledge of the subject he was discussing. Among those who took part in the discussion were Messrs. William Melvin, Frank P. Rand, R. W. Jones, George N. Olot, and A. L. Voorhees. The majority decided in favor of the single tax. A committee was appointed to lay out a plan for future meetings. The next meeting will be held on Wednesday evening, February 15. The subject of discussion will be, "The Cause and Effect of Monopolies and How the Single Tax will Effect Them."
Topeka Single Tax Men.
TOPEKA, Kan., Feb. 2.—About twenty-five of the single tax men of this city met last Tuesday evening and organized the Topeka single tax league with John G. Coughler, president; R. R. Gaskill, vice-president, and A. E. Davis, secretary and treasurer. We are not going to be satisfied with simply an organization, but will push the work of making converts.
A. E. DAVIS.

DR. W
The Fe
guis
toms
Strik
The A
day eve
on gres
was fu
filled i
deliver
Strikes
ing wa
lin, pre
anti-po
and tr
dently
ordinar
siasm
nounce
of the
of Mus
Penns
and of
Lab
Henry
would
chorus
Tara's
Dr. Mc
follow
Mr. C
expect
labor i
kent n
of a d
the dis
the dis
even i
disab
there i
hope i
the ar
not my
to-night
I fran
have u
stistics
fice, a
with a
bearing
prob
a most
Who
prob
united
politic
is the
tribut
the es
prob
It is
course
some i
should
from t
our e
gener
show
parati
this i
could
to had
read
clearl
ing it
to stri
can b
appl
This
lem c
clos
religi
not m
but of
questi
the ve
him w
trusts
they t
these
to fal
that
then
good
erty
shall
sacre
dence
unlike
magn
faith
of his
telling
stran
had b
have
bitter
trodd
of m
ing a
God; i
lists
most
men:
the li
Intuit
throu
obed
men.
The
law l
stra
plan
that
desp
term
earth
in pe
high
men
educ
lent
mov
labo
eas
rich
happ
culti
will
of e
actu
that
mos
that
cate
mat
us
esse
cha
Ind
bein
hber
ther
equ
sary
the
suit
buc
atio
his.

ANTI-POVERTY.

DR. McGLYNN ON "THE STRIKES AND THE LABOR MOVEMENT."

The Forty-first Public Meeting—Labor Organizations Not a Remedy—The Struggle for a Dignified—The Best Place to Strike Is at the Ballot Box.

The Academy of Music was crowded last Sunday evening as it has seldom been before save on great occasions. Every part of the house was fully occupied and the vestibules were filled with persons standing. Dr. McGlynn delivered the address of the evening on "The Strikes and the Labor Movement." The meeting was presided over by Dr. Jeremiah Coughlin, president of the downtown branch of the anti-poverty society. The exclusively labor and trade organization elements were evidently present in stronger force even than on ordinary occasions, and there was great enthusiasm manifested when Dr. Coughlin announced that the next Sunday night's meeting of the Anti-poverty society at the Academy of Music would be devoted to an entertainment for the benefit of the striking miners of Pennsylvania, under the auspices of the society and of the district assemblies of the Knights of Labor. He announced that Dr. McGlynn, Henry George and other prominent speakers would deliver the addresses. The Concordia chorus sang "The Harp that once through Tara's halls," which was encored and then Dr. McGlynn was introduced and spoke as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: You expect to hear me speak on strikes and the labor problem. These strikes are but a violent manifestation, an eruption, a symptom of a deadly disease. They are no cure for the disease (applause), and their chief value is that they make so manifest the existence of the disease, and that most consoling fact that even in the outcast multitudes of men, the disinherited, the down-trodden, the dying, there is still enough manhood left to make us hope for the possibility of a radical cure by the application of a radical remedy. It is not my purpose to dwell at any great length to-night upon the history of strikes, with which I frankly confess I am not very familiar. I have not thought it necessary to gather statistics concerning them. It is rather my office, as it is my purpose, to content myself with certain general principles and facts bearing upon these strikes and upon the labor problem of which they are an attempted and a most clumsy and unsatisfactory solution.

What is this labor problem? It is the problem of all life. It is the problem that our united labor party is endeavoring to solve by political methods. It is the problem which it is the office of this anti-poverty society to contribute its share toward solving by preaching the essential doctrine by which alone the problem can be solved. (Applause.)

It is not my object to-night to utterly discourage men who are striking or who may at some future time be tempted to strike, but I should feel that I had gained very much if from the strikes that are going on beneath our eyes, from former strikes and certain general principles concerning them, I could show to the strikers and to all men the comparative, if not the absolute, uselessness of this blind groping after the remedy—since it could point out some lessons that should serve to induce men to give up the useless, quick remedies for a constitutional disease, to see clearly the wrong and the means of remedying it, and then to strike, one and all, to strike together there where alone the strike can be effectual—at the ballot box. (Wild applause and cheering, lasting over a minute.)

This labor problem, I repeat, is the problem of all life. And therefore it is most closely connected with all those fundamental religious questions that necessarily concern the right ordering of our lives here, but our eternal destiny hereafter. It is the question: How shall rational men, created in the very image of the creator, endowed by him with unalienable rights and gifts, precious trusts as well as inestimable gifts, for which they must render to him an account, so use these gifts, so sacredly guard these trusts as to fulfill their destiny, to develop the natures that he has given them? The labor problem then is just this: How shall we assert, make good and practical, our right to life, to liberty and the pursuit of happiness? How shall men make practically unalienable these sacred trusts that our Declaration of Independence so truly tells us are *de jure*, in right, unalienable? The Declaration in that magnificent profession of a religious faith in the creator and in the equality of his essential gifts to his children, is not telling us of a fact, but of a right. It were a strange mockery of history if the Declaration had been intended to assert the fact that men have always in fact been equal. It were a bitter mockery of the outraged, the down-trodden, the robbed, the disinherited masses of men throughout the ages to assert to the gall of a falsity. But right is right, as God is God; and right is necessarily eternal if it exists at all; and the highest endeavor, the most earnest desire, the holiest enthusiasm of men should ever be to square the fact with the law, to make history the magnificent evolution of God's law, of God's providence, through the intelligent and the loving obedience of the minds and the hearts of men.

The fact is unfortunately in strange dissonance with the law. If labor, God's law let us obey the law. (Applause.) It were strangely unwise in us to seek to amend his plan and to stifle the exercise of the labor that he has given us. It is ever the excuse of despotism that men need to be governed paternally, as if any fatherly government on earth can surpass in goodness, in wisdom and in power the fatherly government of the most high God. (Applause.) Paternal government! Men need to be led! It is dangerous to teach these theories prevalent in paternal governments. Now this movement of ours, in its attempt to solve the labor problem, means that because men are equal, endowed with the equal, unalienable right to life, to liberty and to the pursuit of happiness, that all have the equal right to cultivate their intelligence, to discipline their will, so that the child of the humblest denizen of earth may aspire to fill the highest niche in the temple of fame. It is a theory that has actually been broached in our country that from a Christian standpoint the most desirable condition of society is that in which there shall be a highly educated few and the uneducated many. It is a matter of grave importance, therefore, for us to assert in season and out of season the essential religious character, the anti-pagan character of our immortal Declaration of Independence (applause); to assert that men being born with an equal right to life, to liberty and to the pursuit of happiness are, therefore, endowed by their creator with an equal right to all those things that are necessary for the maintenance of that life, for the enjoyment of that liberty, for that pursuit of happiness—that all the general bounties of his magnificent and lavish creation are the gift of one Father equally to all his family, and not to a chosen few. It is the

object of this platform of ours, of the united labor party, to solve the problem on these lines. These are the lines of eternal truth and justice. These are the lines indicated by the essential teaching of all religion.

The labor problem, in a more prosaic way of stating it, is simply this: How shall all men be able to maintain their lives and to exert their energies during this mortal life upon the natural bounties in such way that they shall always be able to obtain the employment that they need or desire, and when they have obtained such employment, how shall they be perfectly secure in the enjoyment of the fruits of their labor? That is the whole labor problem in a nutshell. How shall such condition of things be brought about? It is simply false to say that men have equal rights to life, to liberty, to the pursuit of happiness, if you deny that they have equal rights to the general bounties of nature, without which life cannot be maintained at all, without free access to which there can be no true liberty, without the proper employment of which there can be no pursuit of happiness. (Applause.) Surely it were a mockery of the Christian gospel to say that oppression is so good a thing that it must be an act of virtue on the part of the oppressor to give to the oppressed so admirable an opportunity of exercising heroic virtue. (Laughter and great applause.) Poverty, and the consequent misery and vice and crime that are the result of the violation of God's law, but are the result of the violation of God's law; so that the strike and the revolution and the bloodshed and the arson, horrid and cruel as they are, only tell that God's law has been violated, and that the outraged sense of human dignity shall never be appeased till perfect justice shall be done. (Applause, repeated again and again.) The law of gravitation is a very good thing. And as in the physical world that simple law explains all things, so in the moral world the simple universal law of God is justice. (Applause.)

I am not here to justify or to encourage strikes. But I do say that I find much comfort in them. (Applause.) I find much comfort in discovering that even in the most ignorant and oppressed, the most miserable, the least supplied with all good things of earth, there is still at least as much of human spirit to make the crushed human worm turn, and at least snarl defiant protest even while he is being crushed to death. (Great applause and cheers.) The strike is a violent remedy against a more violent wrong. (Applause.) It is by usurpation, it is by robbery, it is by craft, it is by over-reaching, it is by bribery, by perjury, by the defiance of God's law and the natural instincts of the human heart, which are a part of God's law, that this horrid landlordism, this monopoly in the natural bounties has everywhere begun. And that wrong must necessarily work itself out to its legitimate conclusion, to the oppression, the robbery, the debasement, the degradation, the extermination of a large portion of God's family. And it is entirely creditable to the original dignity of them that they will not give up the fight without at least protesting, that they will not quietly sit down or lie down and die without at least cursing the infamous robbery, even if they have the heroic Christian charity not to curse the robber. (Applause.) There would be no use of strikes—there would be no use of strikes; strikes would be simply merely an absurdity and an impossibility—if the essential principles of this platform were carried into practice by the peaceful remedy of the ballot. (Applause.)

Complaint has been made by some of our good friends, some occasional visitors at these meetings, that they have come sometimes several times and have heard little or nothing of the distinctive doctrines of this platform, and therefore I desire to supplement this omission. What we are aiming at is simply this: To secure for all men abundant opportunity to employ their labor and the full natural wages of their labor either in the thing that they produce by their labor or a perfect equivalent for that in the product of somebody else's labor. (Applause.) It seems a truism, it is so obvious. And yet the world is so stupid, God and nature with a little mixture of malevolence, that this obvious truth is denounced as revolutionary, as subversive of law and order. And, saddest to say, the name of sweet religion is invoked to perpetuate injustice, to denounce, to calumniate, to revile the men who, surely for no love of self, have been impelled by the humanity within them—may, impelled by the love of God, their father—to do something in their brief time to right the wrong, to teach men not to curse God and die, but if possible to bless God and continue to live here so that when he shall call them they shall be transferred from the kingdom of heaven here to the kingdom of heaven beyond. (Applause.)

What are we here for, anyhow? Is it to eat and drink and crawl about for a little while on the surface of this globe? Not small as we are, the most oppressed son or daughter can stand up and say: "I am greater than all the physical universe." (Applause.) There is something here within me that shall survive the wreck of worlds, and I am dearer to God, my father, than all the wondrous suns, than all the harmonies of the spheres." (Great applause.) If we are to reason and faith conspire to tell us we are, then in God's name we are something more than mere crawling things, wearing out our wretched, miserable life; we are the children of the Father, we are workers to learn his tasks. And the law that he has given for this magnificent workshop must be obeyed, and that law is justice. And if, as saints and seers have prophesied, this earth shall be some time the kingdom of the Father, it will only be when all the world shall enjoy the unspeakable bounties pronounced upon those who shall have hungered and thirsted for justice with the assurance that they shall have their fill (applause), when the teachings of the Master shall have been incorporated in the spirit of all our laws. Now, then, it is a logical necessity, if we believe in religion at all, to accept all this, and to believe, therefore, that our present condition of society is a mockery, a violation of God's law, a blasphemy against his beneficent designs. And we need not complain that we are reviled for teaching these things. We have ever been so, and we can find unspeakable comfort in the knowledge of the fact that those who persecute the teachers of a truth to-day will be making tardy reparation to-morrow for the injury that they have done to-day. (Applause.) It is true of every great moral and social reform that the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church. (Applause.)

I have said before that no matter how wonderfully a man may preach a great truth with his head, he cannot have his head cut off the good fortune for the preaching of that truth, he will preach it ten times better with his head off than with his head on. (Great cheering and repeated applause.) It is not my purpose to-night, while I still have my head on (laughter), to preach to our afflicted brethren who are striking in the coal mining regions of Pennsylvania that they should discontinue their strike. I have no such advice to give them. (Applause.) But I would say to them that even though their strike should be successful, they should feel the victory to be so wretched and poor and paltry a thing that it was hardly worth contending for (applause)—a wretched gain of eight per cent, or something of the kind. I am trying to say, dear friends, that if I thought this society of ours

had nothing more satisfactory than a question of percentages, if it had no remedy to propose greater than a reduction of a certain percentage of the rent of Irish tenants or the increase to the very small extent of eight per cent of the wages for eight months in the year of miners in Pennsylvania, I should really not think the game worth the candle. (Applause.)

Let us hope that these good, suffering friends of ours will win the strike and get the eight per cent, or whatever it is that they want. But how much nearer will they be to their goal than they were before? How much better will their wives and children be clad, or schooled, or fed, or housed? How much more civilized will they and their successors be likely to be if that scale of wages can be maintained?

Ah, no! It is too dreary a spectacle. I have been conversing with some intelligent man, a working man who visited in the interest of labor organizations some little while ago these very mining regions, and the tale that he tells is one full of infinite pathos. We saw in the New York Times an editorial a few days ago that these striking miners, if they chose, at any moment could go to work again at two dollars and a half a day. This man who was on the spot told me that the miners could get two dollars and a half a day for eight months in the year, but that out of this two dollars and a half they have to pay for their own powder and their fuses and their oil, and then to pay an assistant, so that two dollars and a half are the wages of two men and the supplies necessary for doing the work. And besides, if they are wise miners and prudent, and not entirely unselfish, they will take care to purchase with the very limited amount of money that would remain to them their little groceries and the like from the company's store. There is no absolute compulsion to buy from the company's store. But the man who does so gets a discount, he gets a breast of coal, I believe they call it, while the poor wretches who will have been so unwise as not to patronize the company's store, to give outrageous, usurious profits to that company out of their miserable wages, will be put at less desirable work, where they can make less wages and where their lives are seriously imperiled in the work that is called "robbing the mine," which, I believe, consists in paring down the columns of coal and sometimes taking them away altogether, so that the ceiling will fall in and rob them of their lives. (Applause.) It is so easy for a man in the editorial sanctum to settle the affairs of the workingmen—(laughter and applause)—and to show how well paid they are and how ungrateful they are to the kind employers, to those paternal coal companies and railway companies, that actually, it would seem, have gone into the business of coal mining and railroading more as a philanthropic enterprise than as a money making business. (Laughter.)

Let us hope that they will win the strike! But if they should not, they probably will be nearer to their redemption than if they should. (Applause.) Things have got to get worse before they can get better. (Applause.) And if they should not win this strike, they perhaps will be a little more impressed with the fact that there is something wrong in the present system, than if they should be pleased, tickled, with a sort of childish glee for a few weeks or a few months at having gained a wondrous victory! And what is the lesson that they ought to learn? That the strike is not much good anyhow. That it is only a wretched euphemism, a political plaster for the mere symptom of the disease. It is only a mere palliative; and what they need is a fundamental remedy, a medicine that shall purge the system, shall restore the system to perfect health. And the strike is no such remedy. Why, we are actually told that the companies are making money by the strike, that the supposed scarcity of coal is putting money into the coffers of these bloated corporations. The price of coal is going up, and so, for any extent of time, the prices for your coal, dear friends, you are also asked to contribute something to help to keep up the strike. And actually the money that you are putting into the coffers of these people by buying their coal, and the funds with which your charity is aiding these striking miners, will be going into the pockets of these corporations. (Applause.)

Now, God forbid that anybody should understand from me that you are not to contribute generously. I beg you to contribute as generously as you can (applause) at the benefit here, to the relief of the joint auspices of our society and of the Knights of Labor, and next Sunday I beg that you will come in greater numbers and prepared to give a great collection. But I repeat that this is only a palliative. Save some of these people from starving. Help them to maintain the strike, to maintain them for a little while longer. Do it, in God's name. But while we are doing this charity, let us send a burning message with our poor dole, to tell them to be men and to show their manhood not merely by this wretched strike against the superior violence, but by striking where they can strike with wondrous potency—at the ballot box. (Applause.)

The golden stream that has been pouring from this country into Ireland for the last thirty years or more has actually chiefly gone to benefit the landlord. (Applause.) I don't say therefore these Irish sons and daughters should forget their fathers and mothers, therefore they should refuse to send them money because it goes largely to maintain landlordism. But I do say, in God's name, while doing what they can to maintain the strike, let them by word and work and prayer contribute to what they can to hasten the day when the curse of landlordism shall be destroyed root and branch. (Applause.)

Those who clearly see the truth we are preaching can have but little patience with the pothering of Mr. Parnell and Mr. Gladstone on the other side and Mr. Powderly on this side with some petty question of percentages of rent, homesteads and the like. Let them come out and see the truth and preach it—that God has given the land of every nation to the people of that nation; that the land is to be shared by all; that to deprive the least of the land of that nation is to rob him of his inheritance, and to be guilty of a blasphemous iniquity against the beneficent design of the creator. (Applause.)

Mentioning the name of Mr. Powderly recalls his pothering about Guilford Miller and his homestead—some old man two or three thousand miles off who found he had a homestead and then he hadn't. President Cleveland's authority was invoked to give him the homestead. Suppose Mr. Guilford Miller's homestead thirty or forty years from now was the center of a town of fifty or sixty thousand inhabitants, that would be a funny kind of a homestead wouldn't it? That poor homestead would be the biggest kind of a bloated landlord. Now that is no doctrine of ours. We are only too glad that he or anybody else should have a homestead. We will be absolutely from taxes all the products of his industry, but we will not immediately give him his homestead, because it was worth nothing, shall not by his industry but irrespective of his industry, have acquired a rental value, we do not want him

to rob the community of that value which the community has produced. (Applause.)

If Mr. Powderly and others cannot see that, more's the pity. They ought to see it. Mr. Powderly many years ago recommended to the Knights of Labor to read "Progress and Poverty." I wonder has he read it himself? (Applause.) Thank goodness, a good many of them took his advice. (Applause.) And thank goodness, a good many more people have read it without taking his advice.

There is one man in congress to-day—there are three or four hundred of them I believe—but there is one man in whom I feel a particular interest. He is a man with the somewhat unwonted name of Smith. (Laughter.) He is from Milwaukee, and I have the pleasure to say—I say it in all seriousness—the honor of his name is a wonderful thing. He was named him at a labor gathering on the Fourth of July last in Milwaukee, and conceived a very high esteem and affection for the man. He is the only man to-day in congress elected by the labor party—a labor party in Milwaukee in the very greatest sympathy with the platform on which we stand. That man said one of the most sensible things that have ever been said by a congressman. And I said at a little meeting that I attended last night that if he keeps on saying such good things as that, we might do worse than nominate him for the presidency. Some reporters of one of our metropolitan journals had interviews with as many as possible members of congress about the strikes. And most of them straddled. They favored the workingmen, but, of course, they believed in law and order. They looked not into the cause. And Smith, the laboring man—I think he told me he was a plowwright, a plowsmith—he said: "The place to strike is at the ballot box." (Applause.)

And now I mention Mr. Powderly's name. I am reminded of another victory. On this platform last Sunday evening I mentioned what I believed to be the fact, that Mr. Powderly in his well known negotiations with the archbishop of Baltimore, and through the archbishop of Baltimore with the see of Rome, in order to have this society of the Knights of Labor—a society of American workingmen—protected from the interference of the pope, had sent an ambassador to the pope, the order of Rome to negotiate for the protection and immunity of the Knights of Labor. You have seen in the newspapers certain apparent denials of what I have said. Now, I have no desire to insist upon mere technicalities and quibble about mere words. What I said I asserted upon the authority of one or more than one man or men very high in the councils of the Knights of Labor. (Applause.) And since that assertion was made and denied, I have been assured on similar statements that my assertion was substantially correct. (Applause.) And I am glad to see that the publication of what I said has actually brought out a substantial confession from parties very much interested in the truth of what I said. First, there was an apparent, most ingenious and frank and full denial by Mr. Powderly of anything and everything that I had said on the subject. And because of my reaffirmation of the substantial truth of what I said with some additional circumstances, there appeared in the newspapers a day or two ago a very remarkable statement from Mr. Tom O'Reilly, in which he said no doubt he was the man referred to in my remarks, and kindly said some pleasant things about me, and while saying he was not in Rome and has not been in Europe for six years, said he was actually busily engaged in heading off the torrents of misrepresentation against the Knights of Labor pouring into Rome. That is substantially a confession of all that I wanted to make out. Mr. O'Reilly has not denied absolutely, as we as I can make out, that somebody sent to Rome that some money was spent for the purpose of paying his expenses to Rome. But whether that be true or not I am not going to quibble about it. The only point that I wish to make has been made good actually by the confession of Mr. O'Reilly that in this American order of the Knights of Labor there was a man, who recognized himself as a most intimate confidential friend of Mr. Powderly, who was engaged in trying to head off misrepresentations in Rome against this order. And the point I wanted to make and make sure was that had the pope of Rome, what had these cardinals in Rome to do with this American business? (Applause.) The obvious attitude of the Knights of Labor should be to say to each individual: "We care nothing for your religion. You may believe anything or nothing, and if the rules of this society do not suit you or your religion you may get out." (Great applause.)

I have told you that a man will preach any great truth better with his head cut off than with his head on. That is precisely my own case. (Applause.) I can never entirely stifle my passion, my heart, that was somewhat morbidly enlarged. From to-day early day I have been in the uncomfortable position of a man with liberal ideas subjected to the absolute dictation of a despotic machine. (Laughter.) I have told you recently some of the things that I think about the ecclesiastical machine, so I shall not thresh that old straw again to-night. (Laughter.) Some seventeen years ago I was driven by my love of the church to say some strong words against the alliance of the corrupt temporal power and wealth of what we call the machine. I came very near coming to grief then. I hinted that the public schools were not godless schools, and that in order to believe in God it was not necessary to keep saying God, God, God, God. (Laughter.) I hinted there was a proper time and place to worship God, and the place to worship him best was in our minds and hearts. (Applause.) I have been on the ragged edge ever since then. A few years ago I was desperately singled out and ordered to discuss that school question in a theological conference. And when I went there I heard such sentiments as these uttered by a man who is now a bishop, that the pastor could not give absolution to those who sent children to the public schools, that teachers earning their bread in public schools were bound in conscience to give up their positions. I had gone to that conference with some sort of prudential reserve, but when I heard such talk I threw all prudence to the winds. (Applause.) I began with my usual modesty and diffidence (laughter) and tried for about three minutes to get off these prudential reasons. I had a paper with questions between my fingers and I kept twisting it and speedily it was reduced to pulp. And finally I shook myself loose. (Applause.) I paced that platform and delivered a philippic for nearly an hour. That did not add to the esteem of the ecclesiastical machine for any prudence or conservatism. (Applause.) But I had been ordered to discuss the school question, and when a man is ordered to discuss a thing isn't he expected to say what he thinks? (Great applause.)

Then here, five years ago, came the Irish land league question, and I, overcoming a great deal of reluctance, yielding to the entreaties of an editor who to-day is one of the bitterest foes of this platform (cries of "Ford! Ford!" hisses and hoots) and loses no opportunity of maligning it—I came upon that platform to stand shoulder to shoulder with Michael Davitt. (Applause.) And I said that Bishop Roke said (Applause). And my suspension was almost immediately ordered from Rome. And so little eager was I to get out of the sanctuary that I sacrificed

my rights as a man and as a lover of the land of my father and mother. The Lord forgive me! (Applause.) And I promised that I would make no more land league speeches. The Lord forgive me! (Applause.) You can easily understand that the edge upon which I was balancing myself was becoming more and more ragged.

And then I went to speak for the poor of New York at Chickering hall, having been forbidden to attend any political meeting in future without permission of the propaganda. And so little eager was I to break the ties that bound me to the Christian altar that I consented—the Lord forgive me!—to make no more speeches. The archbishop suspended me for two weeks and I bore it in silence. One Sunday I went to Jersey City and received communion, and another Sunday to Philadelphia. Then after two weeks the archbishop took occasion from a newspaper account of an interview to suspend me to the end of the year. I repressed myself for the sake of a higher good. But in spite of my earnest desire to avoid the present condition of things it has, as if by a special providence, been forced upon me.

And now then comes the application of the principle that I desire to make. My head has been unfortunately cut off, and I discover that I am able to preach to larger multitudes, with more freedom, more energy, more force, and as if God were blessing my efforts. I humbly believe he is. (Great applause, three times repeated.) And, I was saying, I humbly believe, with perhaps more efficacy than ever before, preaching the truths of God. I accept the situation. I wrote a letter last Friday to the beloved friends of St. Stephen's parish, who have shown such extraordinary devotion to me. And what I said I meant, and I desire here to-night to remove all suspense, and to say that their protest is simply worse than futile. I appreciate and reciprocate their love and sympathy. I am grateful for their generosity. But it is simply impossible, without a moral revolution, for me ever again to be pastor of St. Stephen's church. It is morally certain that for many years I shall never, with the permission of bishop or archbishop or cardinal or pope, minister before any Catholic altar. That is the painful fact, and I beg of my dear friends to accept it and make the best of it.

And therefore do I desire (murmurs and cries of "No! no!") and I insist, and I have a right to insist, that those meetings of vain and useless protest and the source of unnecessary irritation shall cease. I beg it as a favor and I demand it as a right. (Round after round of applause.)

It has been perhaps facetiously said that it may be said that it is not Dr. McGlynn's funeral. If it is not my funeral, whose is it? (A voice: "Archbishop Corrigan's.") No! I am the cause of it, the cause of the dissection. They will not send me back, and now to terminate the matter I don't want to go back. (Great applause.) And you—and you, if you love me, should not ask me to go back (cries of "No! never!"), for it is impossible for me to go back except on such conditions as would be an outrage to you and to me. (Applause.) It is impossible for me to go back without retracting and humbly apologizing (cries of "Never! never!") for what I have said from this platform, and I never shall. (Great applause.) It is not possible for your wishes to be gratified for me to go back except on the condition that I shall submit to the exercise of a man in Rome to forbid me to go at the request of my fellow citizens to confer with them on a social or a political question. I shall never accept such condition. (Applause.) They have it in their power, in their despotic power, to exact conditions like this: that if I am to be restored to my ministry, it shall not be to the altars that I have helped to build, to the church that I helped to plan, to the people who have become as dear to me as if they were a part of myself; no, it shall be to go wherever they choose to send me. And if, if they had sent me, in the exercise of their authority, a year ago; if they had ordered me to go forthwith the same day or next morning, I assure you, before God, I should have gone instantly and uncomplainingly. But at the same time, whether in St. Stephen's church, New York, or in Middletown—Orange county, I think it is (laughter)—I should still have believed, and I probably should have exercised the right that I believe I had, to express my opinions at proper time or place to my fellow citizens, whether in speech, book, newspaper, interview or whatsoever other form. And these men made it a condition that I should swear, if need be before witnesses, that I would never do anything of the kind without their permission. And I never can do it. (Cries of "Never! never!" and applause.)

And so I thank my God that while I have done my best to prevent and retard this consummation it has come at last (applause), and I am emancipated. I cheerfully and unhesitatingly profess my allegiance to all the teachings of Christ and his holy religion—to all the spiritual doctrines of the apostolic church, and my profoundest reverence for all the sacred things of which she is the custodian, and I reaffirm with all possible solemnity, and I should do it if this were my dying breath, that I believe that the church of Christ has largely been ruined by the despotism, by the politics, by the intrigues, by the love of temporal power and wealth of what we call the "ecclesiastical machine." (Applause.)

Some good ecclesiastical friends, after I had been suspended and then at last excommunicated, tried to reopen this case of mine, and, with a sort of negative, passive acquiescence on my part, they have been writing to Rome voluminous statements and sending copies of letters to Cardinal Gibbons which had found their way into his waste basket at Rome. And this was the excuse: Because a certain letter that should have been left with the propaganda had got into the Archbishop Gibbons' waste basket. And these letters and documents and overtures sent to Rome months and months ago have not even received the courteous acknowledgment of a receipt. And now it is my determination, which I avow before you here, that the first letter I send to Rome will be simply to disavow the action of these kind friends of mine, and to tell them that I have no case before them whatsoever.

I shall continue, as I have throughout my life, to believe what I have believed, to love what I have loved, and with the love of God my Father and His grace, that is not confined to sacraments, I shall seek to love him to serve him. I entreat of those who can without sacrificing their manhood, not merely to believe the teachings of the church, but to receive her ministrations. But I advise you if this machine shall make it a condition of your receiving its ministrations that you shall sacrifice your manhood, your rights as citizens, as workingmen, then trust to the boundless mercy of God. Keep your manhood, and rather than sacrifice your manhood tell them to keep their sacraments to themselves. (Great applause.)

And, doctor, father, what will become of you? I am in the hands of my father and He is infinitely powerful and infinitely wise and infinitely good to me. He has always been so much better to me than my deserts. And I repose upon His fatherly bosom in the embrace of His fatherly arms with all the tender confidence of a little infant sleeping in the arms of its mother. Have no fear for me. I defy all their malignity. (Great applause.) And I here publicly give them warning that,

much as I regret it—and I call you to bear me witness that hitherto I have most jealously and carefully refrained from it—if they shall think to hound me with the arts of which they are masters I shall expose them. (Great applause.) I shall do it—I shall do it, with the help of God, not in a spirit of vindictiveness. It is poor thing to require reviling with reviling. But I shall do it in legitimate self defense—not, merely—but in defense of a cause that is more sacred to me than even my honor or my life. (Applause.) What this machine hates with intense malignity is not the man, but the cause. And so help me God, I shall not permit the cause to suffer at my presence if I can help it. (Cries of "Good!" and great applause.) I have hitherto contented myself with pointing out the abuses of the machine, historical abuses of the machine, and thousands of years old. But I give them warning that I am full of knowledge of events that might make the country too hot to hold some of them (great applause), and that it will be the part of prudence for them to let me alone. (Applause.)

UNITY CONGREGATION.

The Success of the Meetings Recently Assured—Mr. Pentecost's Sermon on "A Foolish Practice."

The statement on the back of the printed order of services distributed on Sunday at the meeting of Unity congregation showed that there are now 134 regular contributors who agree to pay various sums amounting in all to \$43.65 a week. If the loose collection at the meetings average as much more, the congregation is financially in good condition. These who were most active in organizing the meetings believe that there is now no doubt of their successful continuance. Of the people who attend, a large part, perhaps a large majority, have attended regularly from the beginning, and in response to Mr. Pentecost's request many of these have introduced themselves to him and personal relations have been established between them. Contrary to the general rule as to religious gatherings, there are fully twice as many men as women in the congregation.

All the assistance that Mr. Pentecost receives is entirely voluntary except that of the musicians. The music with which the meetings open and which is played when the collection is taken up, is instrumental; there is no choir. The instruments used are at present piano, violin, cello and cornet. The cornet leads the singing, and the tunes to which the hymns are sung are almost all familiar to those who have attended Protestant churches. Mr. Pentecost says he desires to make the meetings in every way as attractive as possible and any surplus over the absolutely necessary expenditures will be used to that end.

However much he may disagree with the sentiments expressed at the meetings, no man can listen to Mr. Pentecost without hearing much that will appeal to his best feelings and call out his strongest reasoning powers.

The Brooklyn and Newark meetings are as well attended and as satisfactory to Mr. Pentecost as those held in Masonic temple.

The sermon last Sunday morning was on "A Foolish Practice," the text being taken from Philippians 4, ii, "I have learned in whatsoever state I am therein to be content."

Jesus, said Mr. Pentecost, knew what contentment in its highest sense was, not the peaceful comfort of the pet cat who purrs by the fire, but the strong poise of one conscious of resources which will suffice in any emergency. The majority make false estimates of their own and their neighbor's needs, and thus their misjudgment makes real happiness, and, as a result, are subject to surprises, chagrin and disappointment. How few rosy, sunshiny people there are; how few are good natured; how few have no quarrel with the world on their own account. How sour, grumpy, cross-grained most people are.

Here Mr. Pentecost showed that this discontent arose from people not recognizing that external conditions could not of themselves produce happiness, there being no cure for discontent except in the mind itself.

Discontent, said Mr. Pentecost, makes us unwillingness to adjust ourselves to our circumstances in case we cannot bend circumstances to our will. There are two things, the old adage says, you should not fret about, what you can help, and what you can't help. When circumstances are stubborn, as they frequently are, peace of mind depends upon the comparatively simple process of adjusting yourself to them.

Contentment is not the mild virtue sometimes supposed to adorn only soft and placid natures and those of great strength of character, great resolution of purpose.

Involuntary poverty as a social disease is a curse because it is unjustly forced upon people who are just as unfit for poverty as wealth; but a brave heart is foolish to fear poverty. Nothing destroys the moral sense more than the fear of poverty.

Sickness as a rule is not to be feared, and to drop out of "society" is a blessing. A few friends are all that one needs, few and true; and he who has a good wife, or she who has a good husband and children, needs no other companions.

Make the best of your lot. Don't be dolefully resigned to your mournful circumstances or you will be a nuisance to yourself and to your friends. Take the bull by the horns. "Some men make a mighty fuss about bulls," said a farmer as he took up a club and climbed into a field from which a bull had just chased a terrified man, and, when the bull bore down on him, he knocked him down. All snavellers take courage when they see such a man.

But it is also necessary to be discontented, discontented with your ignorance while knowledge is so cheap. You have a little time left from work; consider your ignorance and kindle the divine flame of discontent in your breast which will drive you to a little study and a little thought. If the average man will not read and think how will superstitions and social wrongs be overthrown? There is another phase of noble discontent—discontent at the miseries of others. Last week I heard a public speaker declare that all people in this country should be thankful for their unexampled prosperity. In his view everybody has plenty. He has \$12,000 a year salary as a public officer. I could have wept as I heard him and thought of the women who sew and cough their wretched lives away in this city; of the nine thousand children under twelve years of age who are starved and sew on buttons and do other work to help meet the family expenses; of the men who ask to be sent to prison for food and warmth. How can you and I be content to gorge ourselves while these wretched creatures starve in fine apparel while others shiver in rags?

I do not say you have no right to what you have, or even that you should go forth and give what you have to the poor. You would do no good in this way. But I do say that you ought to apply your mind to the problem which the unequal distribution of wealth presents. You ought to seek a remedy. You ought to seek to keep the poor from contentment while such unjust social conditions exist.

Buddha said: To the poor salvation ought to come. And he could not remain in his princely estate while others suffered. To the poor salvation ought to come. And he walked homeless and homeless among them, discontented on their account.

Never play the miser. Strive to be more and better than you are and to redeem those who sit in darkness and despair, victims of man's injustice and inhumanity to man.

land question will turn back or cease to rise if we do not keep our sabers clashing in every political fight, whether it concerns the land question or not. The light of our truth is spreading night and day, and I doubt if even the intermediate calm be not better than the political storm for its diffusion.

As, "in the midst of arms the law is silent," so, in the midst of political clamor, reason is silent.

The great mass of passive popular intelligence is being slowly but satisfactorily moved by our unceasing labors.

The people are everywhere beginning to realize that there is some connection between the robbery of labor and the collection of private toll for the use of natural opportunities, between enforced idleness and speculation in the bounties of nature, between the starvation wages of competition and the land monopoly which prevents displaced labor from employing itself at natural wages.

They are thinking, and no earthly power or impotence can check the current of their thoughts—

Not poppy, nor mandragora,
Nor all the drowsy stuffs of the world,
Can ever medicine them to that dull sleep
Which yesterday they owned.

JAMES G. MAGUIRE.

THE NEW YORK COUNTY COMMITTEE.

The Officers Elected for the Coming Year—Words of Approval for Mayor Hewitt—The Australian Ballot System Indorsed.

At the monthly meeting of the New York county committee of the united labor party, held on the 2d inst., the following officers for the year 1888 were elected, John McLackin having been elected chairman at the January meeting: First vice chairman, William McCabe; second vice chairman, August W. Mayer; recording secretary, F. C. Leubuscher; financial secretary, Patrick Doody; corresponding secretary, J. G. Gains; treasurer, R. J. Hawkes; sergeant-at-arms, O'Hara. A committee was appointed to revise the constitution and report at the March meeting. The county executive committee reported that Dr. William Gottlieb had been elected chairman and Professor William B. Clarke secretary, and that a re-election had been ordered in the Eighteenth district. The difficulties in the Fifteenth district were referred to the executive committee.

The following resolutions were adopted: Introduced by Mr. E. J. Shriver: Resolved, That the cardinal principles of the united labor party have been its organization, and still are, that all taxes upon the products of industry should be abolished, and that "such agencies as are in their nature monopolies," should be placed under public control; and

Whereas, Recent messages from the mayor of this city involve a partial admission of the truth of our principles;

Resolved, That this county committee welcomes the greater admission of the mayor to correct economic doctrines, and regrets only that he has not been led to confess the entire truth.

Resolved, That, recognizing fully that the present elevated railroad system is entirely inadequate to the needs of the city, and that it is wretchedly mismanaged, we yet protest against any new proposition which would result simply in turning over the means of rapid transit from one set of monopolists to the grasp of another monopoly, already dangerously powerful throughout the state, which the mayor practically proposes in his suggestion that the New York Central should succeed the Manhattan elevated in control of the agencies of rapid transit.

Resolved, That we insist upon the true principle as advocated by the united labor party, that the city should both own and operate its rapid transit system, and that it should grant no more public franchises to be used for private benefit, but rather resume those already disposed of; and we call upon all citizens who agree with this declaration to join the united labor party in its efforts to protect the public against any further infringement of its rights.

Introduced by Mr. F. C. Leubuscher: Whereas, There are now pending in the legislature various bills pertaining to the reform of the election laws; and

Whereas, The united labor party is the first and only party which has placed itself on record as favoring such reform, and especially the Australian system of balloting; therefore,

Resolved, That the chairman appoint a committee of five which shall immediately consider said bill and prepare proper blank petitions for distribution among the several assembly district organizations.

A resolution was also adopted approving of the meeting of the anti-poverty society and Knights of Labor, on behalf of the striking miners, at the Academy of Music on the 12th inst.

Of Interest to Readers in Ontario.

TORONTO, Ont.—Our anti-poverty society is making an effort to have the subject of local option brought before the legislature, and wish to call the attention of all Ontario fellow workers to the importance of getting a bill through the legislature giving municipalities the privilege of selecting for themselves what species of property are the most proper objects from which to derive the municipal revenues.

Such a bill, if passed, would give us a great advantage, as it would enable us to bring the subject of taxation up once a year, besides enabling us to concentrate our efforts on some particular municipality if we saw a good opportunity. Another point being that even to-day in this city a vote taken on the subject would probably result in the abolishment of both income and personal taxes, which is a long step in the right direction. If every reader will do what he can by writing to his member and his local paper, we can very likely have the business done. It is so well worth trying for that I would urge every one interested to do what he can. Any communications addressed to Mr. S. T. Wood, our secretary, 25 Shuter street, will be attended to.

R. CARTWRIGHT.

Vice-President Toronto A. P. S.

How Cornell Students are Instructing Their Professors.

ITHACA, N. Y.—Students in Cornell university who before received implicitly the political economy as taught in that institution can now only be shown the fallacies of Quasimodo's views on the subject of taxation.

Professors have been called upon to explain away Chapter IX of Herbert Spencer's "Social Statics," and are asked how he whom they have been led to consider the highest authority on many social questions can entertain the same views on the land question as that "wild man" Henry George. Many of the students have read "Progress and Poverty," and the new instructor in political economy has probably spent more time during the last term in replying to the arguments of that work than has been spent altogether by his predecessors since the university was opened.

Truth and justice being on our side, discussion and attack always help to forward our cause.

MORE OPINIONS.

"STANDARD" READERS' THOUGHTS ABOUT THE COMING CAMPAIGN.

What Are Men to Do Who Believe Neither in Democratic Free Trade Nor in Republican Protection?—Why Not Combine Ourselves to Antagonize—Percy Peppoon Believes in Protection as a Medicine—A Wise General Condemns His Enemies by Cutting Their Forces in Two—Both the Old Parties Trying to Steal Our Principles.

How lively an interest is taken in the question of a presidential nomination is evidenced by the large number of letters that reach THE STANDARD on the subject. The extracts given below convey a fair idea of the various opinions expressed:

D. Briggs, Brooklyn, N. Y.—We must either have a full ticket of our own or else abstain from voting entirely; but as there are many who would rather vote for mischief than not vote at all, I think we should nominate a full ticket.

Charles J. Vogel, New York City.—I think it would be best to nominate state tickets, candidates for congress and local officials where we have organizations of any strength. I would, however, if the leading men thought it best to nominate, support a presidential ticket, too.

James W. Bucklin, Grand Junction, Col.—If a national platform were adopted, leaving the term free trade out, but demanding that all taxes, national, state and municipal, should be raised from land values, would not such a platform state our position exactly, and yet be a platform upon which we could all heartily unite? What business have we, who do not believe in taxing products at all, to take sides in a quarrel as to whether we shall raise our national revenue by taxing American or foreign products? Is not such an issue foreign to the spirit of our cause? If so, how can we consistently vote either the republican or democratic tickets? Where our party is strong, as in New York, we may be able to nominate congressional and legislative candidates without a presidential ticket; but where we are weak, as in Colorado, I doubt that, without a presidential ticket, any state or local tickets in favor of the single tax will be in the field. What then are those of us who have left our old parties, and who believe neither in democratic "free trade" nor in republican "protection" to do in the coming election if we have no ticket? We'll have to take to the woods!

Frank C. Stevens, Albany.—I begin to see the nose of that monster corruption if we fail to enter the national contest this fall. If we do not enter the national contest, it will certainly look to many who are as yet but half convinced, and to the world generally, as though we had taken a step to the rear. We are certainly looked on generally as a free trade party. Why, then, not take the same bold position toward protectionism as we have taken toward socialism. If stragglers cannot fight under our banner, let them fall out. We are fighting for their good as well as ours. Let them know we are fighting for the whole act, and nothing but the whole act.

Howard Briggs, Greencastle, Ind.—Should the united labor party maintain its organization in the presidential campaign of 1888, and should it declare against custom house taxation, are questions to both of which I answer most emphatically yes! The question of free trade is so intimately associated with free soil that the Caesarian operation would be fatal at the birth of our organization.

W. H. Beal, New York City.—The presidential nomination is favored because it will allow us to be counted and furnish occasion for a widespread agitation. Now, admitting that the agitation is the more important, would it not be best to confine ourselves to agitating and relinquish the vain desire to stand up and be counted? If we content ourselves with predicting that neither of the old parties will do anything for the people, the next four years will prove our assertions, and the people will be ready to vote with us in 1892.

David Evans, Meriden, Conn.—A few of us here have left the old parties and are bound by oath not to vote for them again, and we must have a candidate so as to give every voter a chance of declaring our principles by casting their votes with us.

H. M. Smith, Cincinnati, O.—I cannot vote my old ticket (the democratic), nor will I vote the republican, which is no better. Shall I stay at home next fall? Give us a ticket. Yourself, Dr. McGlynn, Hugh O. Pentecost, Dr. Houghton, Louis Post or Judge Maguire; any two of you will do for president and vice president. I care not who, so the ticket is out. We must have it.

V. Fell, Grand Rapids, Mich.—I favor a presidential nomination, first, because only thus can our principles be clearly defined and kept pure; second, disorganization will result if no nomination is made; third, although Cleveland's message was a good one, his party is on the whole no better than the other and is unworthy of our support. I think we should have a presidential ticket anyhow, leaving local nominations to the option of the localities.

I. I. Barnard, Passaic, N. J.—In reference to Mr. Wilder's letter in the issue of January 21, while the specific words "protection" or "free trade" do not appear in the Syracuse declaration, neither do the words "compromise" or "bargain"; and I am still unable to see how we are "to abolish" with one hand and with the other to retain or reimpose taxes on labor or its products.

Samuel W. Williams, Vincennes, Ind.—I favor holding a national conference of our friends at the earliest possible date. I am satisfied to leave the question of a national ticket to the conference. If they, in their assembled wisdom, say we must have a ticket all right. If they deem it best not to nominate I will be content. I favor the following platform, nothing more and nothing less: We favor—1. A single tax on relative land values. 2. The Australian system of voting. 3. The government shall operate railroads, telegraph and telephone lines. 4. Pay, out of the national debt. We oppose—1. Banks of issue. 2. Trusts and monopolies. This platform, when properly understood by the people, will win the masses.

M. W. Norwalk, Albany, N. Y.—I am in favor of nominating a full ticket, but as I voice only my own opinion, would it not be a good idea to have the nominating of a national ticket discussed pro and con and voted upon in each united labor organization, throughout the country, the resolutions to be published in THE STANDARD before a national convention takes place. I make it as a motion; who will second it?

Percy Peppoon, Omaha, Neb.—We all believe that the tariff and all other forms of taxation should be transferred to the land. We do not all believe that in the meantime the taxes should be taken off from foreign productions and placed on the products of home industry. Why then draw the line and

divide the party hopelessly on an issue that we all believe in settling in one way, viz.: the single tax. I for one shall vote for Mr. Blaine and protection as against Mr. Cleveland and free trade or tariff for revenue only, should that issue be made and the united labor party have no candidate. Not that I believe in protection either as good principle or good policy, but because I believe it to be a medicine that the country must have in its present diseased state.

L. M. Davis, Topeka, Kan.—Democrats and Republicans here frequently ask me: "What is that new party getting along?" I answer, "Splendidly. They cast 70,000 votes in New York last fall." The next remark is: "All right; I believe it is a good thing; certainly it can't be worse than either of the old parties. Anything for a change." Now, to-morrow we conclude not to run a ticket, and next day I meet Mr. Jones, who is an anti-prohibition democrat, but nearly converted to the single tax theory, and he says: "Well, friend Davis, do you people expect to poll a pretty large vote in Kansas next fall?" I answer: "Well, no, Mr. Jones, we have concluded not to run a ticket."

"Why and I look him up and down the democratic line, and I would prefer to reduce the tariff on whisky, and we are all going to vote the democratic ticket, as we believe they are coming our way." Some way, I can hardly get up to this. Perhaps I may in time, but I think not. But I dismiss this theory as, to me, unsatisfactory, and turn to the go-as-you-please theory advocated by some. "Leave every man free to do as he pleases. Vote the democratic ticket if you wish, or vote the republican ticket if you choose, but don't forget to preach and practice truth and justice, in season and out of season." Well, here I am again square "up a stump." Candidly, if I am unable to find a principle to advocate, whether successful or not, I would prefer to drop the word "party" entirely, and call ourselves economic educators, and go on discussing political economy until such time as we thought we had a majority of voters. I for one advocate going straight ahead, expecting success, possibly this year, probably next year, certainly the year following. I can see no other alternative.

Benj. Doblin, New York City.—I lay no claim to being a military tactician, but I would consider him a very unwise general who led his command upon the bayonets of the enemy with a clear and positive conviction that he would be defeated, nor would I consider it a valid excuse for him in defense of his action to say: "I desire that we should stand up like men, thereby proving to our opponents that there were men ready to lay down their lives in the cause of freedom." We would admire his enthusiasm and deplore his stupidity. I would consider him a wise general who should confound his enemies by cutting their forces in two and then should slip out from between and leave them to fight each other in the darkness of the battle, with an occasional thrust just to "keep the pot a boiling." Apply this as an analogy to our mooted national campaign and you will see the relevancy.

J. J. New Hamburg, N. Y.—Both the old parties are trying hard to steal our principles and use them to grease their rotten machinery. They want to plaster their sores until after next election—then good-bye for four years to come. We want nothing to do with them. Let us nominate a president and let it be Judge Maguire or Mr. Preston of Brooklyn. I support it. I support the question that Mr. George or Mr. Post should run.

J. G. Malcolm, Hutchinson, Kas.—I am in favor of a national ticket, but am not in favor of a national convention. It is too expensive, and only to be attended by the rich, and would give too much power to wire pullers. I favor a popular nomination. Let each sympathizer sign his name (with address) to a brief affirmation that he believes in the single tax and then give his choice for president. These can all be sent to a place to be agreed on and thus a popular nomination be obtained.

C. A. Thompson, Cincinnati, O.—I would not expect a presidential vote this year much larger than that cast for Henry George for mayor or secretary of state, but the banner of "the land for the people" will have been raised and its followers, even though greatly scattered, will know the march has begun. If not more than five delegates from each of ten or a dozen states appear in a national convention, the work of that convention will be as cheerfully confirmed by the party as if every congressional district in the nation were represented.

A. E. Davis, Topeka, Kas.—Let us assert our principles. Let us show these unthinking seceders, these "free traders," these "protectionists," that the united labor party has a principle to fight for, and does not concern itself with issues which have been dead for twenty years. It seems to me that when we confine our battles to local offices we virtually acknowledge that ours is not the party of "the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man."

C. C. Platt, Ithaca, N. Y.—I am in favor of the united labor party nominating a presidential ticket. In this section, as in almost every other section of the interior of the state, very few had any idea of the new political economy until we began our campaign work. Then our tracts were circulated and read, and they would not be read at other times; thousands assembled to hear our reform explanations, and four reports of the speeches were published in local papers. It is wiser, I think, to advise that our party keep out of all local politics, rather than out of the coming presidential campaign. In so many sections the believers in our reform are few, and to organize conventions to nominate congressmen or candidates for minor offices is impossible. If we make local nominations, those who are not clear on the principles of our party are liable to be chosen as nominees, sometimes because they have been identified with old labor movements; thus the public are led to think our candidate is standing for old issues rather than the new one which we wish to bring before them. How wiser, better, in view of the personal criticism which candidacy for public office always excites, for us to rally under some of the able leaders in our party, nominated for president and vice-president, than under a multitude of candidates for minor offices, many of whom are sure to be very fit subjects for personal attack, and perhaps ridicule.

—, Ponce Park, Volusia Co., Fla.—What the single tax was to New York state the coming one will be (with a full ticket) to the whole Union. I want my first presidential vote for a party founded on such high principles as is embodied in the Syracuse platform. I would much like to see Judge Maguire at the head of the ticket.

J. C. Howe, Homewood.—Whatever may be said about carrying the new movement into the presidential canvass, let us not forget that there is yet a great work to be done before we can have the land (if given full control of government) could incorporate and carry forward successfully the reforms we all wish to see established. Our new rulers must be supported by a large, enthusiastic and intelligent constituency. I would not be understood as opposing the placing of candidates in the field (for it may be wise to do so), only let us not, in discussing the question, forget the importance of an educated constituency. Thought must precede action.

THE CINCINNATI ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY.

The Sixth Public Meeting—R. W. Harrison on Saving the Masses—Dr. DeBeck Talks About Protection—How a Visitor From Cincinnati Was Disappointed.

CINCINNATI, Ohio.—At the sixth meeting of the Anti-poverty society of Cincinnati Mr. H. M. Smith presided. The meeting was opened with the song, "Rescue the Perishing," by the Jubilee choir, after which Mr. R. W. Harrison delivered an address on "Saving the Masses," a subject which has been lately discussed in the Evening Post of this city. He pointed out that poverty is a prime factor in producing vice, and added that through land monopoly, competition for a living had increased so that our commercial and industrial system was saturated with dishonesty, and that so long as that condition of affairs existed the bulk of the people could not become moral.

Mr. Harrison then took up the interviews which the Post representative had with the various ministers of the city on the subject, and referred to the plan of the evangelical bodies—that of merely preaching their doctrines wherever they had a building—as impracticable and absurd. The Universalists and Episcopalians came a little nearer the heart of the matter, for they were prepared to support any poor that might come in among them, thus recognizing poverty as a vice. But aims taking destroys self-respect, and if one has to lose his self-respect in order to get into the church, better be a pagan.

The Mormons had solved the problem for themselves, for there is no poverty in their borders; but when want and the fear of want were abolished by the single tax on land values Mormonism would fall flat as a balloon without gas. He mentioned an interview with a Catholic priest of this city, in which he was told that the Catholic church taught the same doctrine about the land as the anti-poverty society, and added that he considered the Catholic church the nearest of all to the solution of saving the masses, but thought it blameworthy for not speaking more emphatically on the question of poverty.

The anti-poverty doctrine of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man contains the fullness of the gospel of Jesus, by which, only, shall the masses be saved.

After the singing of the Rev. J. Anketell's hymn, "Our Bright Cross Banner," Mr. Fries read "Old Opinions," and then a special anti-poverty arrangement of "Adeste Fideles" was sung by the Jubilee chorus.

Dr. DeBeck then delivered an able and interesting address on the subject of "Protection." He used Voltaire's story of a resident of Saturn coming to the earth a hundred years ago and picking him up a second visit. On his way to the earth he meets an official of the bureau of statistics, who tells him how marvellously production has increased—ten, twenty and sometimes a hundred fold—by the aid of machinery. Of course on his arrival on the earth he expects to find the inhabitants having an easy time and all rolling in wealth, but is astonished to observe, on the contrary, that poverty has become more widespread than ever and thinks they must have a queer way of doing things here, finding out that landlordism is the cause of it.

The meeting closed with "Keep It Before the People."

THINKS WE SHOULD BE AS PRACTICAL AS OUR POLITICS.

CHICAGO, Ill.—There are not a few indications that the truth is dawning on the minds of some who deny that they are of us, who indeed resent the implication almost as an insult. To fail to use these people to advance our position would be a grave error on our part. Among those of us who differ as to the wisdom of nominating a presidential ticket there is one point of action upon which agreement seems to be well nigh unanimous, and that is that our leaders shall meet in national conference. Let us have a conference, then, after the two great parties shall have made their nominations; then will be our time to look calmly over the field, counsel well together and elect the course to pursue.

It has been said by one who was a most skillful politician that it is the unexpected which happens in politics. So it would seem to me, under all the circumstances, that prudence would dictate that we should not now make up our minds to pursue this course or that; but keeping free from bias, wait till the battle between the two great parties is set, and then take the position which shall promise the greatest degree of advance for our cause.

We have succeeded in bringing the free soil idea into practical politics; let us be as practical as our politics; let us get entirely out of the contemplative realm into the active. The material upon closer contact often requires a somewhat different handling from what we thought it would when viewing it at a distance.

Let us not sacrifice one iota of principle; let us say frankly to any who propose going our way at all, "Well, we are going that way, too, and we will help you all we can, but our destination lies beyond yours, and we give you fair notice that we shall not stop when you propose stopping, but shall press right on with as many as we can induce to go with us till the end of our journey is reached."

If either of the two great parties should take up a position that leads our way, surely it would be worse than folly did we not cry hurrah! take all the help we could get from this turn and say "thank you" heartily and cheerfully. I honor those who, zealous for the cause, are eager for the fray under a presidential ticket of our own, for they, no matter what the discouragement, will always be found ready to do their part. These men I love. But if this vital position which leads our way should be taken up by either of the two great parties which, to say the least, in view of some recent utterances, is not entirely improbable, and we should decide not to name presidential electors this year, there will be still for all of us, in the words of a gallant soldier in our civil war, "good fighting almost anywhere along the line" for some time to come.

If we do go into the presidential fight under our own nominations we must attack the tariff abomination with all our hearts, with all our souls, with all our minds and with all our strength, first, last and all the time. Any other course would be suicidal, and we would deserve and receive the most ignominious defeats.

F. S. STEWART.

A TEXAS CORRESPONDENT ON THE SITUATION.

GALVESTON, TEXAS.—Seeing that the majority of STANDARD correspondents desire a nominee for the presidency, I feel it my duty to increase the minority by entering my protest against such a Quixotic course. What advantage could we possibly obtain by "standing up to be counted?" As for me I would just as leave have my vote thrown in the waste basket as to recklessly misuse it. Yes, and even if I had the right to vote for president but once in my life, I would use it this very year in favor of Mr. Cleveland; and, if for no other reason, just in order to help to keep out such men as Blaine and Sherman. I understand full well that principles ought to outweigh personal considerations.

tions, and so they do with me; therefore, knowing that all we could possibly effect would be to change the vote of the state of New York in favor of the republicans, I think we ought to stand up in a solid phalanx to be counted for Grover Cleveland. Don't we all know that the republican party has been and is, *par excellence*, the author, sponsor and defender of monopolies and monopolists? And now shall we commence our national career by helping to bring that organization back into power? Should we signalize our advent into national politics by cutting our own throats right now, when Mr. Cleveland has started the country by doing so much for us and going as far in our direction as he practically is able, and with the democratic party getting ready to sustain him to the utmost?

I believe and know to be true every teaching contained in Henry George's works—works which I am confident will eventually become text books for the world. I don't measure or do anything, or hide part of our light under a bushel, but I do believe that, rather than make caricatures of ourselves by blindly rushing into the national field this summer, it would be better at present to use all our efforts to bring about one single reform—that of the Australian system of voting. If by our assistance that is adopted in the state of New York, and Mayor Hewitt's taxation proposition becomes a law for New York city, we shall have made more real progress than would be the case if, under present circumstances, Henry George himself were president of the United States.

But there is something else I wish to say, namely: that before we can hope to reform our laws we will have to reform our own party name. "United labor" is to the majority of people utterly misleading and is really absurd. It was undoubtedly a good name for the majority campaign in New York city, but with that its usefulness was ended. I am a traveling man and more accustomed to talking than writing; and by talk and by STANDARDS, and occasionally a book, I have made some bona fide converts of strangers, some of whom knew absolutely nothing of our true aims. But I would have made twice as many if I had not had that wrong name to contend with. It seems every body "views with alarm" and distrust a party sailing under a "labor" name; and in spite of all my explanations to the contrary, they tell me it is only got up to catch labor votes in order to get schemers into office. Sometimes, when, after a man has agreed to everything and I am rejecting at his conversion, I happen to mention that unlucky name, it is just like throwing ice water down his back. It annihilates all his new sympathies with a sudden shock and a cold chill, and he is content with having found out from the name that it is a "humbug." And this I find to be the rule with real workmen more than with others; while the ignorant rich and well-to-do see in the name a veritable class movement and sympathize on the whole score. And thus it dispels sympathy from both sides. No; before we appeal to the country let us have a suitable name. I don't see why that cannot be adopted right in New York. I am quite sure that, being willing to labor under the present incubus, none would leave our ranks after being relieved of it. O. F. YORGE.

THE LANDLORD SAW THE POINT.

PERU, Ind.—If you tax money too heavily it hides itself—crawls off to some secret vault or goes to some other state. The tax on whisky sometimes causes its owner to set a mountain on top of it. It is probable that a tax on horses would run them out of the country, and the more burdensome the tax the faster they would run.

A man told me to-day that if his city lot were taxed too heavily he would fix it. "How would you do that?" said I. "I'd stand a big brick house upon it." "How would that fix it?" "Why, you fool, can't you see that I would add to my investment until the tax on the lot would be very small as compared to the whole investment?" "Yes, I see. But why don't you put that house on it now?" "Because I can make twenty per cent on my present investment and that is good enough for me."

"How do you make twenty per cent?" "Well, I don't exactly make it—somebody else makes it—but I get it." "Oh! you mean that somebody wants to use it twenty per cent worse this year than anybody did last year?" "Yes, I guess that's about it, and a little more—about enough to pay the taxes." SMITH.

THE ADVANTAGE OF INDIRECT TAXATION.

Count Tolstoi.

In my young days the game of lotto was introduced into the clubs. Everybody rushed to play it, and, as it was said, many ruined themselves, rendered their families miserable, lost other people's money and government funds and committed suicide, and the game was prohibited and it remains prohibited to this day.

I remember to have seen old and unscrupulous gamblers who told me that this game was particularly pleasing because you did not see from whom you were winning, as is the case in other games: a lucky brought, not money, but chips; each man lost a little stake and his disappointment was not visible. It was the same with roulette, which is everywhere prohibited, and not without reason.

It is the same with money. I possess a magic, inexhaustible ruble; I cut off my coupons and have retired from all the business of the world. Whom do I injure—I, the most inoffensive and kindest of men? But this is nothing more than playing at lotto or roulette, where I do not see the man who shoots himself because of his losses, where I do not see the man who is ruined by the game. I am not to borrow trouble. The path of the reformer is full of thorns, and we shall all find plenty of work.

THE ADVANTAGE OF INDIRECT TAXATION.

Count Tolstoi.

In my young days the game of lotto was introduced into the clubs. Everybody rushed to play it, and, as it was said, many ruined themselves, rendered their families miserable, lost other people's money and government funds and committed suicide, and the game was prohibited and it remains prohibited to this day.

I remember to have seen old and unscrupulous gamblers who told me that this game was particularly pleasing because you did not see from whom you were winning, as is the case in other games: a lucky brought, not money, but chips; each man lost a little stake and his disappointment was not visible. It was the same with roulette, which is everywhere prohibited, and not without reason.

It is the same with money. I possess a magic, inexhaustible ruble; I cut off my coupons and have retired from all the business of the world. Whom do I injure—I, the most inoffensive and kindest of men? But this is nothing more than playing at lotto or roulette, where I do not see the man who shoots himself because of his losses, where I do not see the man who is ruined by the game. I am not to borrow trouble. The path of the reformer is full of thorns, and we shall all find plenty of work.

THE ADVANTAGE OF INDIRECT TAXATION.

Count Tolstoi.

In my young days the game of lotto was introduced into the clubs. Everybody rushed to play it, and, as it was said, many ruined themselves, rendered their families miserable, lost other people's money and government funds and committed suicide, and the game was prohibited and it remains prohibited to this day.

I remember to have seen old and unscrupulous gamblers who told me that this game was particularly pleasing because you did not see from whom you were winning, as is the case in other games: a lucky brought, not money, but chips; each man lost a little stake and his disappointment was not visible. It was the same with roulette, which is everywhere prohibited, and not without reason.

It is the same with money. I possess a magic, inexhaustible ruble; I cut off my coupons and have retired from all the business of the world. Whom do I injure—I, the most inoffensive and kindest of men? But this is nothing more than playing at lotto or roulette, where I do not see the man who shoots himself because of his losses, where I do not see the man who is ruined by the game. I am not to borrow trouble. The path of the reformer is full of thorns, and we shall all find plenty of work.

SLAVERY REVISED AND CORRECTED.

INDIAN RIVER, Mich.—In one of those catchy railroad pamphlets which can be had for a stamp, I find the following paragraph quoted from a circular issued by Messrs. George Prentiss & Co. of Shaw, Bolivar county, Mississippi. They embody a frank advocacy of an improved form of slavery:

We desire particularly to call attention to a remarkable opportunity for northern farmers of means and business men generally to invest to great advantage in northern Mississippi. The soil yields nearly twice the crop of cotton per acre as the average cotton fields of the south, and corn grows to a great height. These timber lands can be purchased at \$5 to \$10 per acre, and in putting them under cultivation a remarkable fact to a northern man presents itself. Instead of cutting down the timber as we do in the north, piling it in hedges and burning it, all that is necessary is to cut down and burn the under brush, say six inches or less in diameter, and girdle the larger trees. This is done for \$1 per acre by the negroes. Then put up a fence and a cabin to each twenty acres, and the land is ready to receive his rent right along. The average rental for such lands under cultivation being \$7 per acre. Usually no rent is paid the first year, but after that the rental commences. The trees are large, but while there is a heavy growth of timber per acre, they are not close together. Hence with the trees deadened and leaves gone enough sunshine gets in coupled with the warm climate to raise good crops among this dead timber.

As the limbs and trees decay and fall the negro tenants burn them at their own expense, and the land is clear of trees and stumps in about eight to ten years, leaving the field as smooth as a floor. And during that time the owner has received his rent right along. Let it be understood that it is recommended to rent these lands to negroes, dividing the land up in twenty-acre lots, fencing and putting up a cabin on each lot, and putting fifteen acres under cultivation (that being the number of acres the average negro family can successfully cultivate), the other five acres being for wood, pasture, etc. The cost of purchasing these lands and putting them under cultivation presents the following remarkable figures:

Manure, say, \$1.50 per acre.....	\$1.50
Seedling 300 acres at \$1.....	300
Fencing 500 acres.....	500
25 cabins at \$20 each.....	500
	\$1,350

making a net cost of less than \$13.50 per acre for land ready to rent.

The average income from these lands would be

\$75 acres improved lands at \$7 per acre per year.....	\$525
Less taxes, say.....	125
	\$400

an average of over \$6.50 per year net income on the improved land, or \$5 per acre on the whole 500 acres. Here is a real estate investment paying 37 per cent on the investment. The man who is not satisfied with such a profit is hard to please.

Again, what is the actual value of such lands under cultivation

THE LENOX FARM.

Sixteen and a half millions of dollars is a great deal of money. A father and son who could save that much out of their earnings during the span of two ordinary lives would have to be very useful and capable men, indeed. Yet more than that has been realized by a man who lived a life entirely to his taste, untroubled by any labor for his bread, on an investment of about \$2,900 made by his father eighty years ago. The father did not make this fortune and neither did the son. All, except the trifling purchase, that was done by the father was to put in his will a clause advising his son to hold on. All that the son did was to hold on. The result was an enormous fortune. The people of New York city once owned a large portion of this island in common. Their representatives seventy years ago sold thirty acres of that common land for a small sum of money. The industry and enterprise of the people and their need for further room increased in fifty years the selling value of that land more than 5,500 fold, that is, from \$3,000 to \$16,500,000, and the man who did nothing but obey his father's advice to hold on got all that increase. He was a good man, as men go, and gave perhaps nearly four out of the sixteen millions to such public objects as suited his sectarian prejudices or his literary fancy, and he thought that the system that made this possible was the best of possible systems of land tenure. No wonder that he thought so, but it is a wonder that the people whose natural inheritance this man unwittingly usurped appear to think so too. The story of the growth of these great things from small beginnings is worth telling.

A subject that occupied a large share of the attention of the common council of New York during the latter portion of the eighteenth and the early years of the present century was the common lands, belonging absolutely to the mayor, aldermen and commonality of the city of New York. On June 29, 1755, the common council ordered a survey of the commons between the post road and Bloomingdale road into lots of five acres each. On Aug. 20, 1792, a survey was ordered of so much of the common land as had not already been sold. On April 1, 1794, a similar survey of all lands sold or unsold was ordered. On Feb. 10, 1796, the committee on common lands reported that they had a survey of these lands made, contemplating that they might thereafter be improved as part of the city, and that they had accordingly had streets laid down. They recommended that one-half of these lots be sold, and the other half leased for a term of twenty years. The report was accepted, and it was resolved that the new system should be put into effect on the 15th of the following month. In this year Casimir H. Goerck, city surveyor, made a map of the commons, which is still in existence. It showed which lots had already been sold, and which remained to be disposed of. The whole plot began in the neighborhood of Madison square, and, spreading out fan-like, it included the greater part of the island, until the Harlem commons, belonging to that village, were met. Subsequently an act of the legislature passed in 1807 laid out streets for the whole island as they now are. As the plan did not precisely coincide with that previously adopted by council, there was much complaint, and the frequency of the petitions showed that many lots had found purchasers. In 1834 city council appointed a committee to consider these complaints.

It is not my purpose in the present article to go into this most interesting story, but to trace the effect of the growth of population in increasing the value of a very small portion of this great common. Among those who acquired some of the land ordered to be leased or sold by the resolution of council adopted on Feb. 10, 1796, was Robert Lenox, a young Scotchman who first visited this country as a midshipman in the British navy. Mr. Lenox is said to have fallen in love with a New York lady during this visit, and shortly after the revolution he came back here, married and engaged in business. Another young Scotchman named Archibald Gracie came over with him and settled here. Mr. Lenox was a successful merchant and he doubtless made numerous investments. Among them was one which has associated the name of Lenox closely with our city's history.

On Nov. 10, 1817, Mr. Lenox bought at foreclosure sale certain lots belonging to the estate of his friend Archibald Gracie, then deceased. Three of these lots lay between Sixty-eighth and Seventy-first streets and Fourth and Fifth avenues and were said to contain four acres and thirty-five perches each. Four others lay between Sixth and Seventh avenues, and extended from Eighty-third to Eighty-seventh streets on the city's plan. They are now, of course, a part of Central park. Two of them were held by Mr. Gracie in fee simple and two on leasehold. Mr. Lenox paid for them \$10,700, a remarkable price for that day. He manifestly paid far more than they were worth, and doubtless did so to relieve the financial embarrassment of the widow of his friend Gracie. He alludes to this fact in his will made in 1839 when he declares that "from considerations known to my family" the property had cost him much more than it was worth even then. Shortly after this purchase Mr. Lenox began negotiations for the exchange of his lots above Eighty-third street, for a portion of the common lands lying adjacent to his lots lying below Seventy-first street, his purpose being to establish a thirty-acre farm at a point, then distant five miles from the city. The result was that on March 30, 1818, the finance committee reported to city council, recommending the proposed exchange. The report says:

The piece of land to be conveyed by Mr. Lenox consists of four lots, two held by him in fee and two on lease at \$10 per annum each, one for five and the other for seven years from the first of May next, lying to-

gether, fronting on the Sixth and extending toward the Seventh avenue, containing 30 1/2 acres. These lots are Nos. 163, 164, 167 and 168 on the corporation map of public lands. The property is under considerable improvements, is principally a smooth piece of ground with about two hundred fruit trees of various descriptions, and on the Sixth avenue is enclosed with a good substantial fence. On the north and east boundary, however, it is either open or the fence is of little or no value. One hundred dollars per annum are offered for the four lots during continuance of present lease. Mr. Lenox is to receive from the corporation a deed for three lots, Nos. 125, 126 and 131 on the aforesaid map, containing 16 1/2 acres, which are now under lease to him for five years from the first of May next, at \$10 per annum each. This property extends from the Fourth to the Fifth avenue, and is about one-half a mile nearer the city than the preceding, but is not so well improved nor is it naturally so valuable a piece of land. The fences are poor and a part of the ground is rough and uneven.

The terms of the exchange involved the surrender of the first named lots and the payment of \$500 by Mr. Lenox. The lots reverting to the city were those leased for \$100 a year, which is the only part of the transaction that gives us any basis for an estimate of the value of the property affected by it. The lots now included in Central park were then valued at \$2,000, and Mr. Lenox owned but one-half of them, so that he practically paid for the Fifth avenue tract \$1,500. Singularly enough all declarations of the price paid for these lots found in numerous allusions to the transaction are based on the consideration named in the deed, and no writer appears to have examined the records of the city council giving a full report of the transaction. The adjacent lots held by Mr. Lenox were doubtless worth no more than those newly acquired by him, and hence it appears that seventy years ago the value of the Lenox "Farm at the Five Mile Stone," extending from Sixty-eighth to Seventy-fourth streets and including all the land between Fourth and Fifth avenues, was \$3,000.

The description of the two properties exchanged in the report quoted above shows that at that time the ground was regarded as only valuable for farming purposes or as sites for suburban residences. The Fifth avenue tract then being five miles from town. The property now included in Central park was evidently a farm and orchard, and the condition of the fences, as described in the report, indicates that a portion of it was not very valuable even for farming purposes. Mr. Lenox acquired the thirty acres for farming purposes and he continued until his death, which took place in 1839, to reside at No. 50 Broadway, just below Trinity church.

But though lower Broadway was then a place for private residence the prophetic eye of the thirty old Scotchman saw possibilities in the future for his farm. In his will, dated May 23, 1839, June 23, 1832, and Oct. 4, 1839, he gave and bequeathed to his only son, James Lenox

My farm at the five mile stone, purchased in part from the corporation of New York, and containing about thirty acres, with all its improvements, stock of horses, cattle and farming utensils, for and during the term of his life, and after his death to his heirs forever. My motive for so leaving this property is a firm persuasion that it may at no distant day be the site of a village, and as it cost me much more than its present worth, from circumstances known to my family, I like to cherish the belief it may be realized to them. At all events, I want the experiment made by keeping the property unsold.

On June 23, 1832, Mr. Lenox made a codicil to his will giving the farm absolutely to his son James, but he added: At the same time I wish him to understand that my opinion respecting the property is not changed, and though I withdraw all legal restrictions to his making sale of the whole or any part of the same, yet I enforce on him my advice not to do so. As matters turned out, it was well that Robert Lenox made the codicil, for otherwise, probably, for forty-one years, until the death of James Lenox thirty years after, between Fourth and Fifth avenues would have remained vacant, simply because the people of New York have not yet learned what Thomas Jefferson taught, that "this earth belongs in usufruct to the living," and would therefore have stupidly submitted to the whim of an old man whose very body had long since mouldered into dust. Of course, under the terms of the will, Mr. Lenox might have leased the property on ground rent for the term of his natural life, but the uncertainty of such a tenure would have stood in the way of the full improvement of the property. Furthermore, the numerous benefactions made by James Lenox during his life time would have possibly been prevented.

That these benefactions were liberal and well advised it is a pleasure for me to acknowledge in an article like this. It cannot be too often stated, or too strongly urged, that the quarrel of the advocates of the single tax on land values is not with the individuals who profit by the existing laws, but with the system that enables men thus to reap millions without effort of their own, where they or their fathers have only sown hundreds or, at most, thousands, and to levy taxes for their own private benefit on the community that has created the wealth that they are thus allowed to appropriate. In many instances the beneficiaries of this system fail to recognize that they are under any obligation whatever to the community. This does not appear to have been the case with James Lenox, who, though a shy, reserved man, holding himself aloof from intercourse with strangers, made many munificent gifts to institutions in which he felt an interest. He gave in 1863, to the Presbyterian hospital, the whole block between Seventieth and Seventy-first streets and Fourth and Madison avenues, and contributed largely toward the erection of the building and the endowment of the institution. He gave in 1869 the lots at Seventy-third street and Madison avenue, now occupied by the Phillips Presbyterian church, and during the same year made to the trustees a present of the land occupied by the Presbyterian home for aged women. In 1870 Mr. Lenox presented to trustees the whole front on Fifth avenue between Seventieth and Seventy-first streets as a site for the Lenox library, and the handsome building erected thereon was built at his cost as the final repository of the splendid and unique collection of rare books and works of art gathered by him during his lifetime. This library is now open to the public every day of the week except Monday and Sunday, and it offers to scholars and antiquarians

materials not accessible elsewhere in America. There are no longer any restrictions as to entrance, but the collection is one that will attract those who write books rather than the general reader. Altogether Mr. Lenox has given to these various institutions land and money worth between three and four millions of dollars.

These benefactions are not such as would have come to the public through a just distribution of the great increase in the value of this land caused by the growth of the city northward, but they are, nevertheless, highly creditable to the unobscured old gentleman who lived almost the life of a recluse, and brusquely refused many applications for a glimpse of the library and artistic treasures that his agents had gathered in all parts of the world, which treasures by his will were thrown open to the public. Even if we were to believe that his gifts were the best that could have been made, we cannot but reflect that the dedication to public uses of any portion of the wealth Mr. Lenox acquired through the growth of population was dependent on the will of an individual, and might, and probably would have, gone into private hands had Mr. Lenox not lived and died a bachelor.

The farm at the five mile stone was at the time only an unimportant part of the estate inherited by James Lenox, and hence he had no difficulty in following the advice of his father to hold on to this piece of property until it should increase in value. Nor had he long to wait before there were abundant indications that his father's dream of improvement would be more than realized. The population of New York city in 1840, one year after the death of Robert Lenox, was 312,710. During the next decade it ran up to 515,347, and it became clear to all observers that thenceforward the growth of the city northward must be steady and rapid. There was no longer thought of a possible village at the five mile farm, but men saw that the old dream was to be realized. The idea had long existed in the minds of men. The committee on common lands, reported to city council in 1796 that they had had a survey made of those lands "contemplating that the same may hereafter be improved as part of the city." In 1807 the legislature passed an act laying out the whole island into streets as they now exist. The realization of these hopes doubtless seemed to many to be long delayed, but by 1850 what had appeared to some to be but a dream was seen by all shrewd men to be a certainty of the near future. Three years later the legislature passed the act laying out Central park, and thereafter it probably required none of his father's admonitions to induce James Lenox to hold on to lots so eligibly located.

By the year 1860 population had advanced to 805,651, and the future of his property was assured, but Mr. Lenox was in no haste to sell. It was not until the streets and avenues (including Madison avenue, not laid down in the original plan) had been graded, and the great value of Central park to property owners made apparent, that he announced his willingness to sell. The first sale was made March 23, 1864, when the block between Seventy-second and Seventy-third streets and Fifth and Madison avenues was sold by Mr. Lenox to his nephew, Robert Lenox Kennedy, for \$250,000. As Madison avenue had divided the lots purchased of city council in 1818 into two equal parts, this price was realized for what had cost Mr. Lenox twenty-six years before about \$250—that is to say, the land had advanced in its selling price just one thousand fold. Less than three years later Mr. Kennedy sold the twenty lots in this block, fronting on Seventy-second street, to Clarence S. Brown for \$240,000, and he had previously sold a sufficient number of lots on Seventy-third street for a sum, which, added to the \$240,000 received from Mr. Brown, much more than covered the price he had paid for the whole block, thus leaving him several valuable lots on Fifth and Madison avenues at no cost whatever. Not more than four years afterward Clarence S. Brown sold the lots he had bought of Mr. Kennedy to John Crosby Brown for \$430,000. As these lots occupied just one-half of the block, its total value in 1870 was \$860,000, and this had advanced to \$1,000,000 by 1875, which was four thousand times as much as Robert Lenox had paid the city for it.

Shortly after his first sale to his nephew Mr. Lenox sold to Robert L. Stewart and Alexander Stewart the block between Fifth and Madison avenues and Sixty-eighth and Sixty-ninth streets for \$250,000, and he subsequently made numerous sales of land in smaller parcels at much higher rates. Subsequent sales of such properties by the first purchasers indicated a rapid and enormous increase in values. On Oct. 15, 1869, Mr. Lenox sold the block between Madison and Fourth avenues and Sixty-ninth and Seventieth streets to Thomas Murphy, Peter B. Sweeney, Hugh Smith and Richard B. Connolly for \$257,000, thus showing that the increase in values had not been confined to the Fifth avenue side of the tract, if the judgment of some of the shrewdest scoundrels of the Tweed ring was worth anything. On June 1, 1871, Mr. Lenox sold to William Richardson ten lots on Fifth avenue and two lots to the rear of them on Seventy-third and Seventy-fourth streets for \$325,000, and shortly afterward he sold the whole block between Fourth and Madison avenues and Seventy-second and Seventy-third streets for \$460,000. It is needless, however, to follow up the sales in detail. The property has steadily advanced in selling value until quite recently, when for a time there was a diversion of building operations to the west side of the park. Such a check can be but temporary, however, and in this immediate neighborhood there are indications of a further rise in prices. This property is situated directly opposite the Seventy-second street entrance to the park, and the presence of the Lenox library adds to its attractions. A prominent real estate agent, who has sold a great part of the tract, recently gave to the writer an estimate of the valuation of the various portions of the six blocks purchased by Robert Lenox of the city in 1818 for about \$1,500, and the aggregate value of the whole land is to-day \$5,380,000. This is but half of the Lenox farm.

The other half, now of equal value, was bought by Robert Lenox of the Gracie estate, in 1817, at a price far beyond its value at the time of the sale. It had, however, some time before that, and certainly within the present century, been a part of the common lands, and was sold to Archibald Gracie for less than the \$1,500, that appears to have been its value in 1817. This whole tract then, now worth at a moderate estimate \$16,563,000, was once owned by the people of New York in common, and it was granted within the present century to private owners for a mere song.

In an examination of the Randall farm estate, owned by Sailors' Snug Harbor, that I made nearly a year ago, I found that the people who built on that land have always paid five per cent on the current valuation of the ground, and the city taxes in addition. Had the city of New York treated this land in the same way it would now be deriving from it five per cent ground rent and .0216 in taxes, or .0716 in all, yielding it an income from the estate of \$1,185,396. As the Lenox farm covers but the 46th part of Manhattan such a rate of revenue, holding good throughout the island, would yield to the city over \$623,000,000 annually without imposing on the people any heavier burdens than they now bear. As this would involve the assumption that rents throughout the island are as great as they are on Lenox estate it would be an absurdity. The suggestion has its value, however, in showing people how it might be possible to increase enormously the city's revenue without adding to the existing burdens—for if all of this island ever has as high a rental value as the Lenox farm, under the present system nearly five-sevenths of that vast amount will go into the pockets of private owners, and but a little over two-sevenths into the common treasury. This is just as true of those who buy lands for use as of those who rent, since they have got to pay for the privilege of building far more than their houses as a rule will cost.

The fact that the whole Lenox farm once belonged to the municipality seems to aggravate somewhat the wrong done to the public by the system that permits the private appropriation of these enormous growths in value due to the presence and activity of nearly a million and a half of people on this island. It is not in reality an aggravation, however. We happen to be able to trace this and a number of other estates back to a comparatively recent time when they were owned by the people in common, but it is equally obvious that going but a little further back we shall find this to be true of the whole island. Furthermore, the common councilmen of less than a century ago appear to have been as eager to get rid of all lands held by the people in common as the aldermen of to-day are to get rid of the streets, which are about all the ground that the people still hold in common. They sold these lands for whatever they would bring to enable them to meet the expenses of the petty town of their own day, and they thus betrayed a trust which they were bound to keep inviolate for the generations yet to come, who would form the great city of which they but dreamed. Of course they had no comprehension of what they were doing, and those who bought felt no compunction of conscience about forestalling the land on which future generations must live, though they doubtless approved the laws current in their time which punished the forestalling of food with fine and imprisonment.

It is, therefore, useless to rail against those who sold or those who bought. The village statesmen of a century ago fortunately did not attempt to barter away for immediate cash the present generation's right to tax the land, and in the exercise of this right lies the only remedy for the stupidities they did perpetrate. The city does not need to recover its lost title in the common lands. It does not even need to levy a tax of .0716 on them at their present valuation, though experience shows that they now bear just that burden. It has but to levy a tax sufficient to prevent any more speculation in order to force all vacant land on this island into use, and to thus lower selling values and rents. It must, however, in order to do this make its tax approximate closely to the rental value, and for some years, at least, the experience gained under the existing system will be of use in fixing rental values in the future. When the assessor of the new century levies the tax on the Lenox farm, it will be of some convenience to him to know that in 1888 the twelve blocks once constituting it were capable of paying to the city and to the private individuals then exercising the taxing power the handsome sum of \$1,185,396 a year.

After that century is once ushered in it seems reasonable to assume that gentlemen about to die, but who think that those they leave behind them still need their care and direction, will have to content themselves with the disposal of such wealth as has come into the world through their own efforts or agency, and they will not be tempted to try to confer on their sons a power to tax generations yet unborn for the privilege of living in villages yet to be built. This will save much trouble to the living, and ought not to be without effect in training the minds of the dying to the contemplation of things that logically concern them more, just then, than the future value of corner lots in a world from which they are about to take their final departure.

WM. T. CROASDALE.

The Anti-Poverty Society of Union County, N. J. PLAINFIELD, New Jersey.—On Friday evening, February 3, a number of residents of Union county met at the district court room in Elizabeth, and completed the organization of the anti-poverty society of Union county. The following officers were elected: Benjamin Uner of Elizabeth, president; Read Gordon of Roselle, vice-president; Mayhew H. Davidson of Elizabethport, secretary; and David L. Thompson of Plainfield, treasurer. Five members of the society were also chosen to form, with the officers, an executive committee. The society contemplates an active propaganda throughout Union county, by means of public meetings, tract distribution, etc., and will commence its work immediately. Readers of THE STANDARD in Union county who may desire to join the organization are invited to address the secretary. T. L. McCANDELL.

THOMAS PAINE ON THE SINGLE TAX.

The Evils Which Accompany the Benefits of Civilization—How They May be Remedied—Men are Joint Life Proprietors of the Earth.

CINCINNATI, O.—The cause of the publication by Thomas Paine of his essay on "Agrarian Justice," was a sermon by the bishop of Landaff entitled: "The wisdom and goodness of God in having made both rich and poor," with an appendix containing reflections on the present state of England and France. The following extracts from the essay are sufficient to show that Thomas Paine "saw the cat."

It is wrong to say that God made rich and poor; he made only male and female, and he gave them the earth for their inheritance. . . . To preserve the benefits of civilized life, and to remedy at the same time the evil which it has produced, ought to be considered one of the first objects of reformed legislation. Whether that state that is proudly, perhaps erroneously, called civilization has most promoted or most injured the general happiness of man, is a question that may be strongly contested.

On one side the spectator is dazzled by splendid appearances; on the other he is shocked by extremes of wretchedness, both of which he has created. The most affluent and the most miserable of the human race are to be found in the countries that are called civilized. To understand what the state of society ought to be, it is necessary to have some idea of the natural and primitive state of man, such as it is at this day among the Indians of North America. There is not in that state any of those spectacles of human misery which poverty and want present to our eyes in all the towns and streets of Europe. Poverty, therefore, is a thing created by that which is called civilized life. It exists not in the natural state.

On the other hand, the natural state is without those advantages which flow from agriculture, arts, science and manufactures. The life of an Indian is a continual holiday compared with the poor of Europe; and, on the other hand, it appears to be abject when compared with the rich. Civilization, therefore, or that which is so-called, has operated two ways—to make one part of society more affluent and the other more wretched than would have been the lot of either in a natural state.

It is always possible to go from the natural to the civilized state, but it is never possible to go from the civilized to the natural state. The reason is that man, in a natural state, subsisting by hunting, requires ten times the quantity of land to range over, to procure himself subsistence, than would support him in a civilized state when the earth is cultivated.

When, therefore, a country becomes populous by the additional aids of cultivation, arts and science, there is a necessity of preserving things in that state; because without it there cannot be subsistence for more, perhaps, than a tenth part of the inhabitants. The thing, therefore, now to be done, is to remedy the evils and preserve the benefits that have arisen to society by passing from the natural to the civilized state. In taking the matter upon this ground the first principle of civilization ought to have been, and ought to still be, that the condition of every person born into the world, after a state of civilization, ought not to be worse than if he had been born before that period.

But the fact is that the condition of millions in every country in Europe is far worse than if they had been born before civilization began, or had been born among the Indians of North America at the present day.

I will show how this fact has happened. It is a position not to be controverted that the earth, in its natural uncultivated state was and ever would have been the common property of the human race. In that state every man would have been born to property.

He would have been a joint life proprietor with the rest of the property in the soil and in all its natural productions, vegetable and animal.

There could be no such thing as landed property originally. Man did not make the earth, and, though he had a natural right to occupy it, he had no right to make as his property in perpetuity any part of it. . . . Where then arose the idea of landed property? I answer that when cultivation began the idea of landed property began with it, from the impossibility of separating the improvement made by cultivation from the earth itself, upon which the improvement was made; but it is nevertheless true that it is the value of the improvement only, and not the earth itself, that is individual property. Every proprietor therefore owes to the community a ground rent for the land which he holds.

Yours truly, ALFRED S. HOUGHTON, M. D.

Father Huntington's Lecture at Oyster Bay.

Oyster Bay, Long Island, N. Y. The lecture on Tuesday evening by Rev. Father Huntington on the "Tenement House System in New York City" was a vivid portrayal of the hideous and deadly evils that must necessarily follow such an unnatural and crowded condition of human life. The speaker, in describing this herding together of men, women and children, spoke as follows: "One block in a tenement house district will measure 700 by 200 feet. On all four sides are rows of tenements four or five stories high. Behind one-third of the houses in these rows are rear houses with smaller rooms, darker and dirtier passages, backed often by another rear house, a brewery, a stable, or a factory. Altogether there are 1,736 rooms. In these rooms live 3,970 souls, divided into 490 families; thus, on the average, each family of five persons occupies three rooms. The population of some parts of New York is 240,000 to the square mile; the most densely populated part of London has 170,000. Of course in many cases the family is larger (some of the very poorest people take lodgers) and in a number of instances we have found fourteen or fifteen grown persons occupying two rooms, or even one. And then many of these 'rooms' are hardly more than closets and dark closets at that. Almost all the bed rooms measure only seven feet by six feet and have but one door and one window. The door leads into the apartment that serves as kitchen, parlor, sitting room, laundry and work shop, and the window opens on a dark stairway, up which the moisture from the cellar and the sewer gas from the drains are constantly rising. One-fifth of these rooms, too, are in basements below the level of the street, and nearly half of even the outer rooms open into courts only twenty feet wide, in which there are usually several wooden privies for the use of the fifteen or twenty families in the front and rear houses." We have thus substantially quoted Father Huntington's language that we may the more intelligently write what we have to say. How such a horrible condition of human life can be tolerated in a supposedly civilized and Christian city is not easily explained. There must be something radically wrong in our system of educational, moral and religious training by which such a burlesque on home life becomes possible. It may be true, after all, that Henry George and his followers are doing God's service by insisting that the poor

have an equal right with the more fortunate of mankind to the earth upon which we have a dwelling place. Family life, distinct and apart from the common herd, must be maintained; but this can only be done as the poorer classes are granted their inalienable right to live. We are so entirely bound up in self that practically we adopt the old adage by "letting the devil take the hindmost," and right here comes in the difficulty. God has provided an abundance for the purpose of supplying the wants of all his children, and were it not for the "grab game" played on all sides life in every instance would be made tolerable. Talk and pray as we may, yet does the fact remain that the best of us are doing comparatively little for suffering humanity. We say "grace" over our own well laden tables while we do not lift a finger "to keep the wolf" from the door of a deeply distressed neighbor. But we should not deceive ourselves, for there is a day of reckoning coming, and we must meet it. Rev. Father Huntington is to be greatly commended for devoting his entire life to the good of his race. His lecture was an earnest appeal for the unfortunate poor.

A LETTER FROM JOHN H. KEYSER.

He Defends His System of Charity and Arraigns the Impracticable Methods of the Charity Organization Society—If a Man be Hungry, Feed Him.

NEW YORK.—May I say a word in reply to your criticisms on "Charity and Justice" in last week's issue of THE STANDARD?

As you referred to my work of feeding the hungry in the criticism, and also in the previous week's issue, I would rise to explain. I am a radical and not a surface reformer, one who believes that when justice obtains in human society there will be little need of charity.

I do not believe that justice can ever attain without altering the basic laws upon which society now rests its rotten and trembling foundations, and I have been working steadily for many years to destroy those foundations. But while I so believe and act, I am unwilling to withhold "the cup of cold water" or food from a starving brother.

It is just here that my course would diverge from the impracticable and methodical charity organization who for fear that some unworthy person might obtain a meal would condemn thousands of hungry and worthy men, enforced idleness, to suffering and starvation.

Neither do I believe in the advance of the average reformer made in advance of the machine charities, for with the spectacle of 2,000 homeless and starving men applying to us daily for a simple meal, neither a reformer nor a reform or labor paper has made a sign. This worse than apathy grieves and saddens me, because I feel that there is not the kindly sympathy toward the suffering and enforced poor that there should be among reformers, and I deeply regret it, for who shall say, "May not my turn come next?"

I have personally witnessed many harrowing scenes in this direction during my two months' ministrations among the hungry and homeless men who were forced to apply to our humble charity. I have seen in the gray morning, before dawn, five or six or eight hundred cold, broken, pasted and very hungry men of all vocations and employments standing in line waiting to be served with a simple meal of bread and coffee. But why so early? Because the large majority were self respecting men, enforced idlers, who in their extremity came, under cover of darkness, and stood in line when they felt that they were unobserved by the gaping crowd.

Let the reader put himself in their places, hungry, homeless, thinly clad and broken spirited, with the thermometer at zero, standing on a thousand feet line, and philosophize as he can upon the morality of charity and the evils that might possibly flow from feeding a hungry man.

There is one safe rule to observe in dealing with the problem of poverty which we would specially urge upon reformers, i. e., work for better conditions; but while you are doing this do all in your power to assuage the sufferings and sorrows of any.

If a man is hungry feed him. Perchance if you restore his strength, his manhood or self-respect, he may in turn help you save the ship. Meretricious ministrations toward those who in their extremity need their better debate but gladden the despairing heart.

JOHN H. KEYSER.

The Secret of the Craze for Immigration.

FAMES in the Tenement House. Why is all this craze for immigration? Is a thickly settled country the happiest country? On the contrary, don't thick population produce tramps and beggars, and poverty and misery, while such conditions are not known in a new country, or one which has grown with a healthy increase? We want people, plenty of people, is the big newspaper cry. For what? Isn't this the cry of the sharp speculator and big land investor, the syndicates and the corporations? These individuals will reap a rich harvest from such a rapid rise in lands. They will make their jack at once; they can skip out for Europe or anywhere and enjoy their fortunes, and look back at the dupes, who have luddled together and are ruined and are forced to scrounge for a living. We've got people here now who have none but wretched homes, and live from hand to mouth struggling to get along in spite of chattel mortgages, and we've got a fine country let us do something to make the people already here more prosperous and contented, if it is as pretended to the interest of the people to have more come, before we try out our immigration. Depend upon it, this immigration that is so loudly urged, will benefit a few already well off in property and will not make the laboring people any better off. I believe if all the land owners could sell on easy terms and reasonable figures, or even for nothing, the great mass to an actual occupier already in the country, it would benefit the donor and add greatly to the prosperity of all, including the grasping merchant. A county of tenants is always a healthy county, and there is no case where the people are nearly all freeholders. Renting and chattel mortgages are the curses of Waller to-day, and if 50,000 more people were to come here the next twelve months it would not benefit a soul but the land holding speculator and merchant.

Slavery for Tramps.

Mail and Express. Is vagrancy a crime? It has not been commonly so held, but it might by statute be made one. The law of Missouri has a statute to that effect; it can hardly do what has just been done in the state of Missouri without throwing a veil over the constitution of the United States. They sell vagrants out here. Formerly they sold vagrants nearly everywhere, and they are now doing so in slavery, the farming out of men and women, too, for their support, was a common incident of the poorhouse administration. But the law discourages it in this country, and it is directly within the inhibition of the thirteenth amendment to the constitution of the United States, which provides that "involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted," shall not exist "within the United States." Therefore, unless vagrancy is a crime in Missouri, and C. Bradley has been duly convicted of that crime, the proceedings of selling him into servitude for a period of six months is in violation of a law for which the great state of Missouri should have more respect. Bradley can no doubt recover his liberty if he can get into court and plead the constitution, but Missouri should not put itself in the position of being wrong as against so pitiful a creature as a tramp.

TWENT

I will
ing. U
my tabl
in Mich
ago, I k
that his
been by
and wa
there ha
his tea
earn en
family
horses
been ins
of his ne
nobody
financial
money
lawyers
The at
letter, fr
Nebraska
lady, a v
writes th
ren (the
very sad
worker, i
this wint
overcoat
on—throu
from w
The child
even Sun
and shoes
my fami
a godsen
let them
thing abo
and woul
the strait
Last ev
(Unitaria
the Hon.
commissi
the labori
Mr. Wrig
tious whi
First, tha
hand in h
poor are
richer. T
ments. H
truth lay
better off.
For instan
of Patagon
tion of civ
the people
would be a
the instan
dition of t
no worse t
formerly,
that it wou
and a stor
States a fe
of their ow
in the sad
body was a
between th
average of
great than
pathy of th
thereby, a
plied and n
so that not
Being a
clement nig
gent to hear
All Souls' c
the use of b
ing, in order
larger andie
It was th
night of the
while yet w
spire, I enc
a nickel to
With the m
missioner of
him that he
next corner
for the poli
saloon) who
the nearest s
get supper,
said he ha
night and th
things to th
succession.
gave him t
charities,"
but their fun
myself to th
whether I th
or tobacco o
money enou
who waste i
uries. But
and clean. S
the ten or fil
had with m
storm as we l
This morn
my door the
January 27,
official annou
The mayor
poor fund ha
figures, or ev
city in distre
Application f
police for reli
to respond to
sufficient of
they can dra
ever had since
ago. There a
city this wint
enders for the
ered them and
cut off. W
for the presen
ganized that
intelligently
It is to be
all the church
benevolent or
masons, the C

PUBLISHER'S NOTES.

It is nothing new for us to receive such letters as the one quoted below. They come but too often. But each one tells a lesson that is never old or stale, and never will be, till the oppression that forces men to write such letters shall be swept away for ever.

—Please do not allow my name to appear in THE STANDARD again. I am in the iron industry—am one of the protected ones; but the protective tariff would prevent my employer from dispensing with my services should he chance to see my name in your paper. I am a real free trader, but I need your protection in this matter.

So must it be as long as men continue to submit cheerfully to the denial of their natural rights, and accept in place of the freedom stolen from them the charitable "protection" of a privileged class. The man who writes this letter has been robbed of his God given right to labor for his own support. He must suffer want in idleness, with plenty all around him, and nature's raw material abounding on every hand, unless some fellow man permits him to exert his muscles and intelligence in production. And so an employer takes him by the hand and tells him to be good and not run after any naughty anti-poverty or free-trade heresies, and work shall be given him, for a time, at all events.

It's a good thing to be an American citizen, but it makes a man blush sometimes.

This comes from a correspondent in Indiana with an order for three copies of "Protection or Free Trade?" and a supply of tracts.

I had begun to despair of ever solving the "labor problem" until I read Mr. George's works. The force of his arguments, the conclusions arrived at and the remedy proposed, seemed to me so in accordance with that spirit of justice and love taught by Jesus Christ that I cannot see how any one calling himself a Christian can offer any opposition to them. You must not measure the success of the movement here by the little we have accomplished. I have taught by business opportunity sowing the good seed which, if not bringing forth fruit at once, may yet, like the bread cast upon the waters, reappear after many days. Having some business with the mayor of this city this evening, I gave him some of the tracts. He told me he had "Progress and Poverty" and "Social Problems," and asked me if I thought there would be any possibility of getting Mr. George to lecture here.

Good friend, we don't measure the success of the movement by what you have accomplished. But the reason is, not that it wouldn't be perfectly just and proper so to measure it, but that neither you nor we can judge how much you have done. Work such as yours is not only the proper measure of our movement, but it is the movement itself; it is the steady pressing forward of the ranks of the new crusade; it is the mode by which our final triumph will be won.

Don't be discouraged if you don't see any immediate effect of your work. It takes time for seed to germinate, and often the sturdiest plants grow from the slowest sprouting seed. And while you are working over the fruitfulness of your efforts, and wishing you could somehow do more efficient work, the thoughts you have dropped into your neighbors' minds are striking root silently, but surely. Keep on with your seed sowing, friends. Talk, agitate, use THE STANDARD and tracts, and leave results to take care of themselves. And be sure of two things: first, that our best allies are those who openly oppose us and in attempting to disprove our doctrine make pro-poverty ridiculous; and next, that when once a man has really commenced to think in our direction no power on earth save death or loss of reason can stop his thinking. Whenever we move at all we must move forward. We can't go backward if we would.

The secretary of land and labor club No. 3 of Chicago writes:

I have been making a canvass and enclose a list of six subscribers and shall keep on at the work. I have sold quite a good many of your books, but THE STANDARD is the paper that does the mission work.

FRIDAY, Ohio.—I am spreading the light wherever I go with what success I may. I find business men, as a rule, the most conservative and hard to get at. But I am willing to listen, and they are as quick as any other class to see the advantage of the single tax. The movement is growing, silently, but fearfully strong; and some day in the near future the pro-poverty press will be a new word.

DETROIT, Mich.—I can't renew my subscription for some time. I am enjoying a vigorous booklet for my agitation, and as one consequence am expected to work in the shipyard and two firms forbid my employer to put me at work on their boats. I now buy THE STANDARD of W. P. Coran, Grand River avenue, because I cannot afford to pay \$1.25 a time. When ever opposes the powers that be must bear out the heavy burden put upon him by the oppressor. I am eating my portion of leeks just now.

ROCHESTER, N. Y.—I enclose find 50 for my subscription to THE STANDARD for one year. There is no paper that I read more carefully or with more satisfaction. Candor to opponents is an admirable feature of it, coupled with the most positive expression of its own views. No one can read it without being impressed with the ability with which it is edited and with a constantly growing confidence that the cause which it advocates will ultimately triumph.

MAINE, Mich.—For inclosed remittance please send a copy of THE STANDARD to the Women's temperance association of this city and twenty-five copies each of the following land and labor tracts.

Yes, we are "gaining ground." In our K. of L. of L. we are at present discussing the single tax, having a committee who bring in objections, which the rest of us answer. A short time ago we took a vote and found all in favor of it but one, and he excused himself on the ground of not understanding it.

WILLIAM R. HALL.

NEW YORK CITY.—I enclose check for \$5, for which send THE STANDARD to the names inclosed. I have written to others, but have not heard from them yet; but will send on a covert whenever I can. The principles which THE STANDARD advocates are gaining slowly but surely every day. It is the pioneer of the nineteenth century.

ANNE MAGUIRE.

Inclosed find \$1.25 to renew my subscription for six months. I could no more do without THE STANDARD to read than I could do without salt to my food. L. F. KELLER.

—My failure to renew my subscription has not been due to negligence nor inattention, but to "stringency of the money market."

However, I can't do without THE STANDARD, and inclose \$2 for a six months' subscription and the items noted on inclosed blank.

MILWAUKEE, Wis.—I send you herewith a clipping from the Milwaukee Labor Herald which I addressed to that paper about the

land boomers business. I send it to you simply to show you that you have hosts of followers and banners scattered around who are doing quiet work for the cause all the time. For myself I am like the fellow in the comic song, "No matter whether I sit or stand I really can't keep still," when I see an opening into which I can throw a broadside of single tax doctrine. In season and out of season I am after some devoted fellow, and all this in spite of myself. Time and again I have received "trump" in order to avoid getting myself disliked and being considered a "boer" and a "crank," but I never can do it. Let an opportunity present itself and I am at it again. And there seems no end to the opportunities. I never can hold my tongue in a Turkish bath. There's always an audience of half a dozen fellows, and you are sure of them for at least three quarters of an hour. They can't escape you. Then there are the street cars, the hotel lobbies, and even the churches. Let the preacher betray an ignorance of, or a prejudice against, our principles, and it's the easiest thing in the world to drop him a friendly letter, inclosing a tract, and pamphlet on the very question that seemed to puzzle him, early on Monday morning. Why, there's opportunities enough. I preach our doctrine to my sweetheart, and her father and her brothers and "her sisters and her cousins and her aunts." I keep right ahead and try to be good natured about it. I never get angry. I leave that to the other fellow. I find it quite easy to brush aside the sophistries of the pro-poverty people. It becomes easier day by day to promulgate and defend our principles. The more they are discussed the simpler and more beautiful they appear. I also find it a good plan to buy a dozen STANDARDS each week and give them away to any one who will promise to read them. I have done this ever since the paper first appeared. And I intend to keep on doing it, until the truth, like a "sea of glory" shall "spread from pole to pole."

PETER MCGILL.

ELIZABETH, N. J.—I enclose find postal notes for \$2.85, for which please forward STANDARDS as per accompanying list. The good cause is strong in this city, and is constantly gaining ground. Every week we have additions to our club. At present we have sixty-one members, all thoroughly orthodox on the land tax issue. S. Jeffersonian L. & C. Club No. 3.

MINNEAPOLIS, Minn.—I circulate THE STANDARD and tracts constantly and have some prospective subscribers. The agitation goes on here continually. We have some men who never get tired. The Scandinavians discuss the land question every week at their churches. Something will come of this in Minnesota. I inclose \$3 for STANDARDS and tracts as per list herewith.

J. B.—

Keep up the work. Keep the circle of THE STANDARD's influence ever widening. Persuade your neighbors to subscribe. Urge your newsmen to increase his sales. Keep the recruit subscriptions flying. Do all this, not because you like THE STANDARD and want it to succeed, but because you love the cause THE STANDARD advocates, and want it to gain ground.

This is what THE STANDARD costs its subscribers:

One subscription, one year, . . . \$2 50
One subscription, six months, . . . 1 25
One subscription, three months, . . . 65
Three or more subscriptions:

One year, each, . . . \$2 00
Six months, each, . . . 1 00
Three months, each, . . . 50

After the first club of three has been sent, subsequent subscriptions may be forwarded at the same reduced rates.

Recruit subscriptions, for four weeks, will be received, singly or in clubs at different addresses at fifteen cents each.

—A number of us are determined to form an anti-poverty society at as early a date as practicable, and after that I hope to do something in the way of securing subscribers for THE STANDARD. And until then I shall continue sending you at least two recruit subscriptions per month. Inclosed find list and money to pay for same.

WM. GEDDES, M. D.

You couldn't do a better or a wiser thing, except to form your anti-poverty society now, at once, without waiting for the early practicable date. Get your friends together—no matter if there are only two or three of you all told—adopt a simple constitution or declaration of principles, choose a president, secretary and treasurer, and there's your anti-poverty society full formed and ready for business.

And when your society is formed see to it that it doesn't remain idle. Remember that it is intended for a tool and not a toy. Make use of it. Get it to work. Bring its members together, let them tell each other what they are doing individually, and settle what they can best do in concert. A society of only three members can do just as efficient work in a small neighborhood as a much larger body. The main thing is that it should work systematically and persistently in one direction, and not waste its force by random efforts. The letters in THE STANDARD may suggest some mode of operations; correspondence with other societies will tell you what they are doing and what methods they find most successful, and your own knowledge of your neighborhood will enable you to judge what can be done with best promise of success.

Form your anti-poverty societies, friends, wherever two or three of you can be brought together. And when you have formed them use them.

The contributions to the recruiting fund for the past week have been:

Georgetown, New York city, . . . 15
E. W. Wainwright, . . . 1 25
J. Friend, Boston, Mass., . . . 50
Miss Middleton, New Orleans, La., . . . 50
E. A. Hall, Chicago, . . . 45
J. J. H., . . . 45
W. H. Wilson, Waltham, Mass., . . . 85
Miss M. A. C., Birmingham, Conn., . . . 2 50

Total for the week, . . . \$7 60
Previously acknowledged, . . . \$25 00
Total to date, . . . \$32 60

Dr. Paley's Foolish Pigeons.

San Francisco, Cal.—If you should see a flock of pigeons in a field of corn, and if instead of picking where and what it wanted, and no more you should see ninety-nine of them gathering all they got into a heap, reserving nothing for themselves but the chief and the refuse, keeping this heap for one, and that the weakest, perhaps worst pigeon of the flock, sitting round, and looking on all the other birds while this one was devouring, throwing about and wasting its and if a pigeon more hardy and hungry than the rest, touched a grain of the hoard, all the others instantly flying upon it and tearing it to pieces, if you should see this, you would see nothing more than what is every day practiced and established among men.

Those memorable words were written about a century ago by Dr. Paley, a liberal and far seeing churchman, whose enlightened views were unpalatable to the aristocracy because they were calculated to render the working classes discontented with the position in which divine providence was supposed to have placed them. His radical sentiments cost him a bishopric.

THE IOWA STATE CONVENTION.

The United Labor Party of Linn County, Iowa, issues a Call for a State Convention to be held at Cedar Rapids, March 1, 1888.

The following call has been issued by the central committee of the united labor party of Linn county, Iowa:

At the delegate convention of the united labor party of Linn county, held in Cedar Rapids, Ia., January 27, 1888, it was unanimously voted to instruct the county central committee to issue a call for a state conference of all friends and sympathizers with the principles of the united labor party in Iowa, to meet at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, on Monday, March 1, 1888, at 10 o'clock a. m., Thursday, March 1, 1888. Now is the time to spread our grand principles, and the committee most earnestly hope that every true friend of the movement for the restoration of the people's rights in the land, will make a strong effort to be present.

In Linn county the united labor party has been organized for over a year, and at a large and enthusiastic county convention held September 12, 1887, the Syracuse (N. Y.) platform was adopted, and an energetic and successful campaign carried on throughout the county. The encouraging success our efforts have met with here, and the many expressions of sympathy with our principles coming from friends in other parts of the state warrants us in believing that the time is rapidly approaching when the people of Iowa will be ready to throw the yoke of monopoly off all its forms, and especially to overthrow "land monopoly," which is the parent of all other monopolies, and "which compels men to pay their fellow creatures for the use of God's gifts to all, and permits monopolizers to deprive labor of the natural opportunities for employment, thus filling the land with tramps and paupers and bringing about an unnatural competition which tends to reduce wages to starvation rates and to make the wealth produced by the labor of the state of those who grow rich by its toil."

Therefore, we call upon all who believe in man's inalienable right to the use of the earth, and to the enjoyment of the just fruits of his labor; all who favor freedom of trade and the abolition of the farce called protection; all who would stop the plundering of Iowa's farmers and laboring men by the gigantic monopoly, coal, iron, oil, insurance, railroad and other monopolies, corporations, trusts, etc., to join with us in an earnest, organized effort to abolish the unjust laws that have created and fostered these robbers of the people.

The committee would urge all friends of the cause in Iowa to bestir themselves at once and make a strong effort to bring out a good attendance from all parts of the state at Cedar Rapids on March 1. A national conference will be called; the entire western states rapidly organizing, and Iowa will be prepared to take part and aid in the work of the national campaign.

Address all correspondence to L. G. Booth, box 80, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. Circulars, tracts, land and labor documents, etc., furnished on application to the committee.

By order of the county central committee, united labor party, Linn county, Iowa.
L. G. Booth, Chairman.

Must He Become a Monopolist in Spite of Himself?

TOWANANDA, N. Y.—Being interested in the manufacture of vinegar I am called upon to become a member of the United States vinegar company, who are forming a trust to monopolize the production and price. Now as I am strongly opposed to monopoly, will some one with more brains than I possess tell me how I am to continue to make vinegar under the following conditions and not become a monopolist?

First—The trust already controls ninety per cent. of the manufacturers of the United States, leaving ten concerns with their combined capital against one.

Second—This combination agree to take all the production of their subscribers at a good price and sell again at an advance of half a cent, thus creating a large fund to undersell or drive out those not in the combination.

Third—To keep out means this and nothing less. A trust to control the production of vinegar, and there is only one way to fight a strong and powerful organization and in the end be crushed out of business.

Now, will some one tell me how I am to protect my interest and not become a monopolist? There is a remedy for monopoly; and remember a monopolist is not necessarily an enemy to justice. As to me, it is clear that our government, which is the people, protects certain industries, or in other words natural resources, thereby creating monopolies, which necessitates unprotected industries to protect themselves by organization or be ground down.

L. D. HOMES.

Anti-Poverty in Toronto.

TORONTO, Canada.—At the last meeting of the Toronto anti-poverty society Mr. W. A. Douglass occupied the chair. The various committees reported progress in pushing the doctrines of this society, and attention was called to the very general dissatisfaction of the public with the inequitable character of our present system of taxation. An instance was given of a firm in a state of bankruptcy assessed on personality to the sum of \$15,000, while a prominent wholesale merchant was assessed at only \$400. It was also pointed out that the executive officers of a joint stock company are taxed on the full amount of their salaries, while if these officers were to dissolve the company and call themselves a firm they would not be taxed on their incomes at all. The secretary reported that he had received a supply of tracts, and that any one addressing S. T. Wood, 65 Shuter street, can obtain copies. An interesting discussion followed on the subject of allowing each municipality to choose its own basis of taxation either by vote of the municipal council or by a popular vote. A deputation was appointed to address a meeting of the journeymen shoemakers in room 2, Richmond hall, on Monday evening, February 23.

Light Breaking in the Schuylkill Valley.

WEST COSSHOCKEN.—The miners here in the Schuylkill valley are beginning to talk about the anti-poverty doctrines, and I believe that so soon as the light begins to break in on their understandings there will be a general stampede to the party that has an issue.

Four years ago I was in the republican ranks, but having the desire to vote intelligently then, as I do now, I watched the antics of the leaders and soon found out that they were playing a game of deception. I then cast my lot with the prohibitionists, and my sympathies are still with them, but realizing as I do the magnitude of the reform which the anti-poverty doctrine will introduce, I can no longer vote (if opportunity be given) any other ticket than that supporting anti-poverty doctrine.

GEO. BUTTERWORTH.

And It's Well Worth Passing Round.

PARKERSBURG, W. Va.—That article from the Harvard Law Library is immense. We are busy passing it around among a class who sneer at the sentimental side of the land question.

W. J. BOHRMAN.

ANTI-POVERTY IN PHILADELPHIA.

Mr. Erickson of Minneapolis Defines and Illustrates the Evil and Points the Remedy—A Doctrine "in Bad Repute"—Mr. Donovan of New York Talks About the Campaign.

PHILADELPHIA, Pa.—A. H. Stephenson presided at the meeting of the Philadelphia anti-poverty society last Sunday evening, and in a few well chosen remarks introduced Mr. Erickson of Minneapolis as the first speaker.

Mr. Erickson's opening sentences contained an allusion to his own state of Minnesota. He said people here thought land was plenty out with them, and they were right; land was plenty there, but, although there were millions of acres lying unused, if any one should think of taking some of it to use, he would find that he would have to mortgage his labor for years, practically for life, before he would be allowed to set his foot on it. When I look around me and see on the one hand the inexhaustible riches, the lavish bounty that the great creator has prepared for his children, and on the other hand, how thousands, yes millions, of little children, old men and women, and even strong men in the prime of life, are starving, stunted and stunted, physically and mentally, in order that a few may live in luxurious idleness, I feel like wringing my hands in indignation and sorrow. To be silent in the face of such facts is to be a coward.

The speaker likened our social system to a hunter pursuing the hare with hounds. The hounds catch the hare and the hunter takes it and gives the hounds the head and the legs. Our laboring people are the hounds and the hare is the hunter. And if any of the poor hounds become weak and famished because the legs and head are not sufficient to keep them strong, the hunter may pity them and give them the tail also. That is what I call charity. Charity is giving the hounds the tail of the hare. And when some hunters find out that other hunters are giving the hounds the tail they will take advantage of that and give the hounds less head and legs. That is why the charity works with us. By reducing the struggle for existence you stimulate competition and consequently lower wages all around.

Then turning to the remedy for this state of things, Mr. Erickson defined the object of the anti-poverty society. What taxing land values means, said he, is this: Land in the heart of your city is far more valuable than land on the outskirts, not because the holders have worked so much harder on it, but because something like a million people have settled around it. To tax land values is merely to take for the common use the value thus created by the common effort, the common presence and the common need. We propose to do away with fines for improving and beautifying and increasing the conveniences of your city. If a man comes into town with a wagon load of produce we will not compel him to go to the city hall first and pay \$1.50 for permission to sell those things, but we will tell him, Come and welcome. Bring all you can. We need it all.

But people ask us how about the poor man who owns a valuable lot and has no money to build anything but a shanty on it. You would rack rent him out of existence. I don't know how it is with you here, but I surmise it is the same as it is with us in Minneapolis. Those poor men who live in that kind of shanty are always worth millions of dollars in land they are keeping, and those are precisely the men we want to rack rent. We want to make them let go. (Great applause.) The men who improve the land they hold would be touched at all.

Chairman Stephenson then made several announcements, and stated that he had fully expected to give notice by invitation from the Episcopal hospital society a lecture would be given by the single tax before that society a member of the anti-poverty society. He was sorry to say, however, that the rector of the parish, who was absent when the invitation was given, had since his return been persuaded by a few members of his congregation to forbid the proposed lecture take place on the ground that this society and the doctrine it holds are in bad repute. This society and the anti-poverty doctrine," continued Mr. Stephenson, are in less and repute among the so-called "savants of society," and there is only one way to bring them into good repute, and that is by coming out boldly and standing by your beliefs in season and out of season. And the higher your position in the community, the greater is your responsibility.

Mr. Donovan of New York was then introduced. He spoke of himself as one of the 65,000 who had voted for Henry George in the majority election of 1886, and said that vote was a blow struck by the united force of the laboring portion of the city's population for the mere purpose of breaking the power of the ring. It was not a vote in favor of the single tax; it was not a vote for industrial freedom. Most of those voters, like himself, had only voted a labor ticket, and knew of little or nothing of a tax on land values. But since that time many, if not most, of those voters had been studying the single tax theory, and the result had been that the last election showed 37,000 anti-poverty missionaries in New York city alone.

Mr. Donovan complimented the Philadelphia society upon its "catholicism," and said the last reform "through what means can this great reform be brought?" was tersely answered in the words, "Through the ballot box." But to make this possible, the ballot box must first be purified; and the first step we take must be in the direction of electoral reform.

The speaker vehemently denounced the malice of those who were endeavoring to create the impression that there was any estrangement between Dr. McGlynn and Henry George. The only foundation for such a report was a difference of opinion between the two men as to the policy of entering the national campaign next fall, which Dr. McGlynn favored, but Henry George did not. He agreed with Dr. McGlynn, and thought we should stand shoulder to shoulder, fighting for the one great principle we all believe in.

The chairman, in his closing remarks, said that Henry George's position was simply that we should throw our weight and influence in with those who are going our way and whose efforts will awaken thought, and who will be compelled to go further in our direction than they want to or intend to. Our work in politics is necessarily an abolition movement. Our single tax movement is essentially a state movement and not a national one. He himself was in favor of holding a convention, and making a platform in which all taxes on industry, whether by customs duties or internal revenue taxes, should be denounced and the beauties of the single tax pointed out. His remarks were received with wild enthusiasm and cheering.

The meeting then adjourned.

J. F. HALBACH.

Anti-Poverty in Baltimore.

BALTIMORE, Feb. 6.—Our anti-poverty society had a great meeting here last night. In spite of the rain, Bates' hall was long before the time of beginning crowded with an audience impatient to hear Mr. George. Every seat was filled, and the aisles were packed with standing men. Among the

audience were a large number of the students of Johns Hopkins university, and many prominent professional men. John Salmon presided, and introduced Mr. George, who made a speech that was listened to with rapt attention and interrupted by frequent and long continued bursts of applause, a few hisses, however, being heard when, toward the conclusion of his lecture, he spoke of protest and adv. "ated the largest free trade. At the conclusion of the lecture Mr. George answered questions, many of them from the Johns Hopkins students, for more than three-quarters of an hour. We all feel that this meeting has given an impulse to the anti-poverty movement in Baltimore, and are anxious to have Dr. McGlynn, Mr. Pentecost or Louis F. Post follow Mr. George as soon as possible.

Statement of the Treasurer of the New York Anti-Poverty Society.

Early in the month of December the executive committee of the anti-poverty society decided to publish a financial statement every month, starting from the 1st of January, up to which time the accounts would be brought by the treasurer's account for the calendar year, which was then in preparation. The following is the statement for the month of January:

ANTI-POVERTY SOCIETY.

Treasurer's statement, month of January, 1888.

Balance January 1st	\$129 38
Ticket sales at meetings	\$93 75
Collections at meetings	416 81
Less rent of Academy, three	\$1,360 37
Sundays	\$25 00
Less rent of piano, three	25 00
months	25 00
Less printing tickets and	46 00
posters	49 87
Less advertising	49 87
Less help at Academy	60 00
Less musical services	60 00
Net receipts from meetings	857 87
Tickets sold by society for	\$102 50
benefit	432 50
Tickets sold by Miss Hunter for	432 50
benefit	91 75
Collection taken at benefit	1,019 75
Less rent of Academy	\$175 00
Printing and advertising	23 00
Musical services	40 00
Help at Academy	7 00
	245 00
	774 75
Initiation fees	46 00
Regular subscriptions	58 00
Occasional donations	12 50
Miscellaneous receipts	2 00
Total net receipts for month	\$1,451 51

Disbursements:

Publishing and issuing tracts	\$179 56
Salaries	144 00
Office rent and sundries	82 63
Printing and stationery	36 53
Net receipts of benefit paid Miss Hunter	774 75
Miscellaneous	7 00
Balance January 30, 1888	\$247 59

MISCELLANEOUS.

OLLENDORF'S

NEURODONTINE.

Instantaneous cure for Toothache, Headache and Neuralgia. 25 cents. Central depot, 308 E. 14th st., N. Y.

CHARLES B. SCHAIDNER,

PHOTOGRAPHER.

280 Third Avenue, cor. 12th street, New York.

Children's Photographs by instantaneous process a specialty.

HOLLAND'S

COFFEE AND DINING ROOMS.

112 Fourth Avenue, Bet. 13th and 14th sts.

JAMES HOGAN, PRINCIPAL AGENT

For James Hogan's \$4 and \$4 shoes. 235 BOWERY, near Prince street.

HENRY GEORGE, DR. MCGLYNN AND

EDWIN, 181 Christie street, N. Y. City.

Piso's Remedy for Catarrh is the

Best, Easiest to Use, and Cheapest.

Sold by druggists or sent by mail.

50c. E. T. Hazeltine, Warren, Pa.

GOOD NEWS

TO LADIES.

Greatest offer. Now a year's time to get orders for our celebrated "Good News" Coffee and Baking Powder, and secure a beautiful Gold Band and a Gold Ring. For particulars see "Good News" Leaflet, sent free by mail. THE GREAT AMERICAN TEA CO., 21 and 23 Vesey St., New York.

UNITED LABOR PARTY.

Following named states who endorse the principles of the United Labor Party and desire to lend active aid in the movement, are requested to communicate with the State Organizers of their respective states, as follows:

California—Judge James G. Maguire, San Francisco.
Connecticut—Robert Pyne, 24 Asylum st., Hartford.
Eastern Pennsylvania—Henry George club, box 190, Philadelphia.
Indiana—Warren Worthing Bailey, Vincennes.
Kentucky—Land and Labor Club No. 1, box 406, Cincinnati.
Louisiana—Jere J. Sullivan, 705 Fulton street, New Orleans.
Massachusetts (Berkshire county)—F. Harvey Lincoln, box 113, Zephaniah.
Maryland—T. H. Garside, 137 West Lexington street, Baltimore.
Minnesota—Central Committee, United Labor Party, 2 Third street, Minneapolis.
New York—John McLaughlin, 23 Cooper Union, New York city.
Ohio—Land and Labor Club No. 1, box 99, Cincinnati.
South Carolina—Benjamin Adams, Charleston.
West Tennessee—Eastern Arkansas and Northern Mississippi—Land and Labor Club No. 2, Rooms, 9 and 10, Cotton Exchange, Memphis, Tenn.